## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN		
SEAN ANTHONY RIKER v.	, Plaintiff,	ORDER 11-cv-602-bbc
TAYLER ANNE RIKER,	Defendant.	
SEAN ANTHONY RIKER  v.  TAYLER ANNE RIKER,	, Plaintiff,	ORDER 12-cv-641-bbc
	Defendant.	
12-cv-641-bbc, dkt. #55.	nas filed a motion to seal closed cases 11- Plaintiff alleges that he has learned court cases and use them as a "reference r Riker.	cv-602-bbc, dkt. #21, and of a website that directs

The general rule is that materials should not be sealed "unless a statute or privilege justifies nondisclosure." <u>United States v. Foster</u>, 564 F.3d 852, 853 (7th Cir. 2009). Plaintiff does not explain the basis for his belief that defendant is under any threat or indicate that defendant has encountered any actual threats to her safety. Instead, he speculates about what

could happen to defendant if some undisclosed person were angry enough about the cases to

seek out defendant and cause her harm. Furthermore, defendant's address has not been

revealed on the public docket in either of these cases, so it appears highly unlikely that

someone could find defendant based on the filings in these cases. Such unsubstantiated

speculation is insufficient reason for sealing a case.

Further complicating things is that plaintiff failed to ask for the record to be sealed until

now, after the cases have been closed and after the case filings have been accessible through

electronic legal databases for some time. Even if these cases were to be sealed, I am unaware

of any instances in which court orders or opinions have been removed from such databases

(other than opinions that have been vacated by a court), so it is unclear what sealing the cases

now would accomplish.

Plaintiff's motion provides insufficient grounds to seal the closed cases, and it will be

denied. I encourage defendant to seek the assistance of local law enforcement if she feels

threatened in any way.

**ORDER** 

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Sean Riker's motion to seal the record in cases 11-cv-

602-bbc, dkt. #21, and 12-cv-641-bbc, dkt. #55, is DENIED.

Entered this 23d day of April, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge

2