

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Daniel Gonzalez, et al. v. County of Alameda, et al.

Gonzalez v. County of Alameda · No. 3:19-cv-07423-JSC · Decided August 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denied Plaintiffs’ administrative motions to seal documents related to an upcoming evidentiary hearing on enforcement of a settlement agreement. The court found that Plaintiffs failed to establish compelling reasons for sealing or comply with the applicable local rule, while reserving consideration of an attorney-client privilege issue for the hearing and keeping one filing locked because of sensitive personal information.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacqueline Scott Corley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	August 18, 2025
DOCKET	3:19-cv-07423-JSC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs filed three administrative motions to seal documents that they presumably intended to use as exhibits at an evidentiary hearing on the County’s motion to enforce a settlement agreement.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Motions to seal judicial records related to a dispositive motion are governed by a compelling-reasons standard, and the moving party bears the burden of overcoming the strong presumption of public access. Requests must also comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5, including the requirement that sealing be narrowly tailored.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Daniel Gonzalez, et al. v. County of Alameda, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- attorney client privilege
- evidence

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

evidence

attorney-client privilege

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiffs demonstrated compelling reasons sufficient to overcome the presumption of public access and justify sealing documents related to a motion to enforce a settlement agreement.
2. Whether Plaintiffs' sealing requests complied with Civil Local Rule 79-5's narrow-tailoring requirement.
3. Whether the retainer agreement was protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege based on the identity of the attorney's clients or the nature of the fee arrangements.
4. Whether the court should determine at that time whether Mr. Geyer waived attorney-client privilege.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs failed to meet the compelling-reasons standard required to seal the documents because their motions did not provide document-specific analysis or factual support showing that sealing outweighed the public's interest in access.
2. Plaintiffs' motions failed to comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5(c) because they were not narrowly tailored and did not adequately identify and justify the sealing of particular materials.
3. The retainer exhibit was not protected by attorney-client privilege merely because it concerned the identity of an attorney's clients or the nature of the attorney's fee arrangements.
4. The court deferred deciding whether Mr. Geyer waived attorney-client privilege until the August 19, 2025 evidentiary hearing.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A party seeking to seal a judicial record ... bears the burden of overcoming this strong presumption by meeting the 'compelling reasons' standard." (at 1)

"Plaintiffs' motions fail to demonstrate compelling reasons or comply with Local Rule 79-5(c)." (at 2)

"generally the identity of an attorney's clients and the nature of his fee arrangements with his clients are not confidential communications protected by the attorney-client privilege." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs sought to seal a retainer agreement, an email, a declaration, and other documents in connection with an upcoming evidentiary hearing on enforcement of a settlement agreement. One motion appeared to seek a ruling that Mr. Geyer had waived attorney-client privilege, while another consisted only of a caption page and purported consents and did not discuss the attached documents. The court found that Plaintiffs failed to explain what sealing standard applied to particular documents or why sealing was justified. Some attachments to one motion contained sensitive personal information concerning Mr. Geyer and did not appear relevant to the underlying dispute.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In advance of the August 19, 2025 evidentiary hearing, Plaintiffs filed administrative motions to seal at Docket Nos. 570, 571, and 580. The County opposed the motions. The district court denied the motions, while keeping certain sensitive attachments to Docket No. 571 locked from public access pending discussion with counsel at the hearing.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006)
- In re Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Marketing, Sales Practices, & Products Liability Litigation, No. 2672 CRB (JSC), 2020 WL 2425792, at *4 (N.D. Cal. May 12, 2020)
- In re Osterhoudt, 722 F.2d 591, 592 (9th Cir. 1983)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2025/daniel-gonzalez-et-al-v-county-of-alameda-et-al-3ogy5szk>