

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 ABDIQAFAR WAGAFE, *et al.*,

No. 2:17-cv-00094-RAJ

11 Plaintiffs,

ORDER

12 v.

13 DONALD TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
14 UNITED STATES, *et al.*,

15 Defendants.
16

17 **I. INTRODUCTION**

18 Before the Court are two motions: (1) Defendants' Motion to Redact Portions of
19 the May 28, 2020 Hearing Transcript, Dkt. # 375, and (2) Defendants' Motion to Seal the
20 Motion to Redact Portions of the May 28, 2020 Hearing Transcript, Dkt. # 374.

21 "There is a strong presumption of public access to the court's files." Western
22 District of Washington Local Civil Rule ("LCR") 5(g). "Only in rare circumstances
23 should a party file a motion, opposition, or reply under seal." LCR 5(g)(5). Generally,
24 the moving party must include "a specific statement of the applicable legal standard and
25 the reasons for keeping a document under seal, with evidentiary support from
26 declarations where necessary." LCR 5(g)(3)(B). However, where parties have entered a
27

28 ORDER – 1

1 stipulated protective order governing the exchange in discovery of documents that a party
2 deems confidential, “a party wishing to file a confidential document it obtained from
3 another party in discovery may file a motion to seal but need not satisfy subpart (3)(B)
4 above. Instead, the party who designated the document confidential must satisfy subpart
5 (3)(B) in its response to the motion to seal or in a stipulated motion.” LCR 5(g)(3). A
6 “good cause” showing under Rule 26(c) will suffice to keep sealed records attached to
7 non-dispositive motions. *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180
8 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal citations omitted).

9 Here, Defendants request redactions to restrict public disclosure of information
10 protected by this Court’s Protective Orders, Dkt. ## 183 and 192. Dkt. # 391. Plaintiffs
11 argue that such redactions are unnecessary because the requested redactions refer to
12 information that has already been made public. *See* Dkt. # 387 at 1. The Court disagrees
13 and finds that Defendants have demonstrated good cause that such redactions are
14 necessary to comply with the Court’s Protective Orders.

15 The Court thereby **GRANTS** the limited redactions requested by Defendants.
16 Dkt. # 375. For the same reasons, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion to seal, Dkt.
17 # 374.

18 DATED this 20th day of October, 2020.

19
20 

21
22 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26
27