

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Schmidt v. Moss Landing Power Company, LLC

Schmidt · No. 25-cv-02475-SK · Decided March 13, 2025

OPINION

Schmidt v. Moss Landing Power Company, LLC

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 MARY-ELIZA SCHMIDT, et al., Case No. 25-cv-02475-SK 8 Plaintiffs,

ORDER RESERVING RULING ON

9 v. MOTION TO SEAL

10 MOSS LANDING POWER COMPANY,

LLC, et al., Regarding Docket No. 2 11 Defendants. 12 13 Now before the Court is the motion to seal an entire exhibit attached to the notice of 14 removal. Historically, courts have recognized a “general right to inspect and copy public records 15 and documents, including judicial records.” Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 597 16 and n. 7 (1978). Thus. “[u]nless a particular court record is one ‘traditionally kept secret,’ a 17 ‘strong presumption in favor of access’ is the starting point.” Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of 18 Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 19 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)). To overcome this strong presumption, a party seeking to 20 seal a judicial record must articulate “compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings 21 that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.” Id. at 22 1178-79 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). As recognized by the Civil Local Rules, 23 “[a] party must explore all reasonable alternatives to filing documents under seal, minimize the 24 number of documents filed under seal, and avoid wherever possible sealing entire documents (as 25 opposed to merely redacting the truly sensitive information in a document).” N.D. Civ. L.R. 79- 26 5(a). 27 In Defendants’ motion to seal, they seek to seal an entire lengthy agreement, instead of 1 motion is overbroad. The Court HEREBY RESERVES RULING on Defendants’ motion to seal. 2 By no later than March 18, 2025, Defendants shall file an amended declaration with the agreement 3 attached narrowly seeking to file under seal only those portions that reveal confidential aspects of 4 || the agreement. If Defendants fail to file the declaration by March 18, 2025, the Court will deny 5 the motion to seal in full. 6 IT IS SO ORDERED. 7 Dated: March 13, 2025 □ Atlin [rw

SALLIE KIM

9 United States Magistrate Judge 10 11 12 13 15 16 = 17 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-fo/2025/schmidt-v-moss-landing-power-company-llc-chnajx40>