

In seeking to file documents under seal, the parties have extended their reliance on the consent protective order in this case too far, resulting in a docket on which a large number of documents are now provisionally sealed. In so doing, the parties have failed to comply with Local Civil Rule 79.2 and Section V(G) of the CM/ECF Policy Manual, which requires parties to specify the exact document or item, or portions thereof, requested to be sealed, how such request overcomes the presumption of access, and the reasons why alternatives to sealing are inadequate. For these reasons, the motions to seal are DENIED. Any party may, within ten (10) days of the date of entry of this order, identify specific documents or portions thereof which they request to be sealed and provide justification for so doing beyond the consent protective order entered in this case.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and failure to demonstrate cause, the pending motions to seal [DE 151, 156, 162, 168, 176, 179, 181, 186] are DENIED.

SO ORDERED, this 5 day of May, 2017.


TERRENCE W. BOYLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE