

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**DOROTHEA REYNOLDS,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**Civil Action 2:11-cv-277  
Judge Algenon L. Marbley  
Magistrate Judge Jolson**

**ROBERT W. SMITH, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**ORDER**

On January 30, 2017, Defendants sought leave to file a numeric key to inmate names referenced in Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and Accompanying Exhibits under seal. (Doc. 231). In support of their Motion, Defendants stated only that they "move[d] to file the numeric key under seal pursuant to this Court's protective order." (*Id.* at 1). On February 9, 2017, the Court denied Defendants' Motion, but held that Defendants could "re-file a more detailed and narrowly tailored motion to seal." (Doc. 232 at 3) (citing *Blasi*, 2016 WL 3765539, at \*1 (noting that a proper motion to seal must "demonstrate[] a compelling reason for filing under seal, . . . must be narrowly tailored to serve that reason," and must "analyze in detail, document by document, the propriety of secrecy, providing reasons and legal citations"))).

Defendants re-filed their unopposed Motion for Leave to File Under Seal on February 15, 2017. (Doc. 233). In the instant Motion, Defendants provide the requisite specificity necessary for the Court to determine whether filing under seal is appropriate. *See Shane Grp., Inc. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of Mich.*, 825 F.3d 299, 307-08 (6th Cir. 2016). Specifically, Defendants explain their statutory obligation to maintain confidentiality of all inmates' names and how the

numeric key satisfies that obligation. For those reasons, and for good cause shown, Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Under Seal (Doc. 233) is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: February 21, 2017

/s/ Kimberly A. Jolson  
KIMBERLY A. JOLSON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE