

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

10 EDWARD CALE,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 UNITED STATES,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C17-1099-MJP

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO SEAL

15 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Seal. (Dkt. Nos. 39,
16 41.)¹ Having reviewed the motion, the response (Dkt. No. 45) and all related papers, the Court
17 DENIES the motion.
18
19
20

21 ¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff's submission at Dkt. No. 39 was titled "Motion to Proceed,
22 Motion to Seal Evidence, Evidence, and Motion to determine where EEO elements of the case
23 will be heard jurisdiction." The Court deemed Dkt. No. 39 to be an opposition to Defendant's
24 motion to dismiss in part, and a motion to seal in part. (Dkt. No. 40.) Plaintiff's submission at
Dkt. No. 41 was titled "Motion to File All of Employee's Files in Their Entirety Under Seal."
The Court deemed Dkt. No. 41 to be an additional submission in support of Dkt. No. 39. (Dkt.
No. 42.)

1 Plaintiff has not identified the document or documents he seeks to file under seal, nor
2 provided any explanation as to why any confidential information in these documents cannot
3 instead be redacted. (See Dkt. Nos. 39, 41.) Nor has Plaintiff attempted to meet and confer with
4 Defendant to attempt to reach agreement on the need to file the document(s) under seal prior to
5 filing this motion. (See Dkt. Nos. 44, 45.) Without knowing which document(s) Plaintiff seeks
6 to file under seal, and the reasons why a less restrictive alternative is not sufficient, the Court is
7 unable to rule on his motion.

8 Therefore, the Court DENIES the motion without prejudice. Plaintiff is directed to
9 review and comply with Local Rule 5(g), which sets forth the requirements which must be met
10 before court records may be sealed or redacted.

11 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

12 Dated April 4, 2018.

13 

14 Marsha J. Pechman
15 United States District Judge