

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA**

**Ellis-Sanders v. Guardian Piazza D'Oro LLC**

Ellis-Sanders · No. 25-cv-1379-JO-DDL · Decided June 9, 2025

---

**OPINION**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA 10 11 OUDREE ELLIS-SANDERS, et al, Case No.: 25-cv-1379-JO-DDL 12  
Plaintiffs, ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S EX 13 v. PARTE MOTION TO SEAL CASE 14  
GUARDIAN PIAZZA D'ORO LLC, et al, 15 Defendants. 16 17 18 Pro se Plaintiff Oudree Ellis-  
Sanders filed a motion requesting to seal her entire case 19 on the grounds that her complaint,  
motion for temporary restraining order ("TRO"), and 20 all documents pertaining to this case  
contains sensitive and private information related to 21 Plaintiff and her minor daughter's medical  
records, disabilities, and requests for disability 22 accommodations.

This request is DENIED IN PART as overbroad. 23 The Court concludes Plaintiff has not met the  
compelling reasons standard to seal 24 this entire case because her generalized privacy concerns  
about her medical conditions do 25 not overcome the strong presumption in favor of the public's  
right to access court 26 records. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th  
Cir.

2006) 27 ("The mere fact that the production of records may lead to a litigant's embarrassment, 28  
incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not, without more, compel the court to 1 seal  
its records.") (internal citations omitted). 2 Plaintiff's complaint and request for temporary  
restraining order allege that 3 Defendants violated her civil rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983,  
Titles II and III of the 4 American with Disabilities Act, California Unruh Act, the Fair Housing  
Act, and California 5 Fair Employment and Housing Act when they ignored her disabilities and  
wrongly initiated 6 an unlawful detainer action against Plaintiff.

See Dkt. 1, Compl. Plaintiff's factual 7 allegations about her medical conditions and disabilities  
are central to whether Plaintiff is 8 entitled to protection under these statutes and whether  
Defendants are liable for these 9 alleged violations. These factual allegations are therefore  
essential to the public's ability to 10 follow and understand Plaintiff's claims and the judicial  
process that unfolds in this 11 case.

*Harrell v. California Forensic Med. Grp., Inc.*, No. 2:15-CV-00579 KJN P, 2015 12 WL 1405567,  
at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2015) (a complaint "is at the heart of the interest 13 in ensuring the  
public's understanding of the judicial process.") (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 14 F.3d at 1179); see  
*Rock v. McHugh*, 819 F.Supp.2d 456, 476 (D.Md.2011) (a sealing order 15 that "would

effectively seal the entire case"... "infringe[s] too extensively on the public 16 right to access court records.") Plaintiff fails to overcome the strong presumption by 17 establishing that the disclosure of this information would either (1) become a vehicle for 18 improper purposes or (2) amount to more than the potential embarrassment, incrimination, 19 or exposure to further litigation to justify sealing.

Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179. 20 However, the Court does find that discrete portions of Plaintiff's filings do meet the 21 compelling reasons standard, and GRANTS IN PART the sealing of (1) Plaintiff's minor 22 daughter's full name; (2) Plaintiff and her minor daughter's medical records filed as Exhibit 23 C filed in support of Plaintiff's TRO motion; and (3) the email addresses of Plaintiff, 24 Defendant Brisco, and third parties contained in Exhibit B and D filed in support of 25 Plaintiff's TRO motion and Exhibit F of Plaintiff's complaint.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(a)(3) 26 ("Unless the court orders otherwise, in an electronic or paper filing with the court that 27 contains... the name of an individual known to be a minor..., a party or nonparty making 28 the filing may include only... the minor's initials[.]"); A.C. v. City of Santa Clara, No. 1 |} 13-CV-03276-HSG, 2015 WL 4076364, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 2, 2015) (sealing medical 2 ||records of a minor when the records contained sensitive information regarding minor's 3 ||mental health and involvement in juvenile court proceedings).

4 Finally, the Court DENIES the sealing of the remaining documents Plaintiff wishes 5 ||to seal because she has not demonstrated they meet the compelling reasons standard, nor 6 || narrowly tailored this request to remove from public viewing only materials that should be 7 protected.

For example, Plaintiff requests to seal other court orders and filings from her 8 ||San Diego Superior Court unlawful detainer action, filings she submitted in California 9 || Court of Appeals case, and her lease agreement for the underlying property in dispute. 10 The Court ORDERS Plaintiff to resubmit her complaint, motion for TRO, motion to 11 ||seal, motion for electronic access, and motion for appointment of counsel using only the 12 |}minor's initials, including in the case caption by June 27, 2025.

For any exhibit where 13 Plaintiff cannot change her minor daughter's full name to initials (for example, police 14 |}report submitted as Exhibit D to complaint and Exhibit H to TRO motion, or in lease 15 |}agreement submitted as Exhibit A to complaint and Exhibit E to TRO motion), Plaintiff 16 ||may redact or black out the minor's full name. It is further ORDERED that all future 17 || filings in this case will only use the minor's initials in the case caption.

18 Plaintiff must also resubmit Exhibit B and D filed in support of Plaintiff's TRO 19 ||motion and Exhibit F of Plaintiff's complaint with redactions to the email addresses of 20 || Plaintiff, Defendant Brisco, and third parties, by June 27, 2025. 21 The Court directs the Clerk of Court to RESTRICT all current filings so that only 22 Court and case participants can access these filings.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 || Dated: June 9, 2025 25 26 Ho orgbfe Tinsook Ohta 27 United  
States District Judge 28

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-southern-district-of-ca/2025/ellis-sanders-v-guardian-piazza-d-oro-llc-1hporf4n>