

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

L.V.Q. v. The GEO Group, Inc.

No. 1:24-cv-0656-KES-CDB (E.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2025) · No. 1:24-cv-0656-KES-CDB · Decided August 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted The GEO Group, Inc.’s unopposed request to seal unredacted documents filed in connection with its motion to appoint a guardian ad litem. The court ordered the declaration of defense counsel and attached exhibits to be sealed until further order, directed the Clerk to restrict access, and required Defendant to submit specified materials within five days.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	August 5, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-0656-KES-CDB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered the defendant's unopposed request to seal unredacted documents inadvertently filed in connection with a motion to appoint a guardian ad litem.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the sealing factors identified in <i>Oregonian Publishing Co. v. U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon</i> , including whether sealing serves a compelling interest, whether that interest would be harmed absent closure, and whether less restrictive alternatives would adequately protect the interest.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- guardianship procedure
- guardian ad litem
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- guardianship procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should seal the unredacted declaration and exhibits filed in connection with the defendant's motion to appoint a guardian ad litem.
2. Whether sealing was necessary because no less restrictive alternative would adequately protect the confidential or protected information.

HOLDINGS

1. The court held that sealing the unredacted declaration of defense counsel and Exhibits A and B attached to the motion to appoint a guardian ad litem was warranted because the documents contained sensitive information that should have been redacted under the court's prior protective order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court finds that, for the reasons stated in Defendant’s request and amended notice of errata, sealing the declaration of Defendant’s counsel and Exhibits A and B attached to Defendant’s motion to appoint guardian ad litem, documents of which contain sensitive information that should have been redacted pursuant to the Court’s order (see Doc. 6), serves a compelling interest.” (at 2)

“The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to lock and make inaccessible to all CM/ECF users the Declaration of Deann R. Rivard and attached exhibits (Doc. 39-1).” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The defendant inadvertently filed unredacted documents containing confidential or protected information in support of its motion to appoint a guardian ad litem. The documents consisted of defense counsel's declaration and two attached exhibits. The defendant represented that the information should have been redacted under the court's prior order allowing the plaintiff to proceed under a pseudonym and granting a protective order, and it submitted redacted versions of the affected materials.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The defendant filed documents supporting its motion to appoint a guardian ad litem, including a declaration and exhibits containing confidential or protected information. The defendant then requested that the unredacted documents be sealed and submitted redacted versions. The court granted the request and directed the Clerk to restrict access to the unredacted filings.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Oregonian Publ'g Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court for Dist. of Or., 920 F.2d 1462 (9th Cir. 1990)

OPINION

L.V.Q. v. The GEO Group, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 L.V.Q., Case No. 1:24-cv-0656-KES-CDB 12 Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S

UNOPPOSED REQUEST TO SEAL

13 v. DOCUMENTS

14 THE GEO GROUP, INC., (Docs. 39, 41, 42)

15 Defendant. 5-DAY DEADLINE

16 17 Pending before the Court is Defendant The GEO Group, Inc.'s ("Defendant") request to seal
18 documents, filed on July 22, 2025 (Doc. 41) and amended notice of errata in support thereof
(Doc. 42) 19 and emailed to the undersigned's chambers¹, along with Defendant's Request to Seal
Documents, 20 declaration of counsel for Defendant in support thereof, and the documents sought
to be sealed. Defendant 21 requests the Court seal its documents filed in connection with
Defendant's motion to appoint guardian ad 22 litem (Doc. 39) which were inadvertently filed with
unredacted confidential or protected information: (1) 23 the Declaration of counsel for Defendant
Deann R. Rivard, (2) Exhibit A thereto, and (3) Exhibit B thereto. 24 (Doc. 41 at 1). Defendant
represents these documents contain information that should have been redacted 25 pursuant to the
June 5, 2024, order granting Plaintiff's ex parte motion to proceed under pseudonym and 26 27 1
Although counsel for Defendant transmitted the documents only to the chambers of the assigned
district judge, the documents were forwarded to the undersigned by the assigned district 28 judge's
chambers staff. 1 for protective order (see Doc. 6) and that Defendant "should have requested an
order granting a sealing 2 and/or redaction request prior to filing." Id. at 2. Defendant requests the
Court grant this sealing request 3 and direct the Clerk of the Court to seal or otherwise restrict
access to these documents. Id. Attached to 4 Defendant's amended notice of errata are the redacted
versions of the affected materials. (Doc. 42 at 3- 5 19). 6 The Court has considered the factors set
forth in *Oregonian Publ'g Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court for Dist. 7 of Or.*, 920 F.2d 1462 (9th Cir. 1990).
The Court finds that, for the reasons stated in Defendant's request 8 and amended notice of errata,
sealing the declaration of Defendant's counsel and Exhibits A and B 9 attached to Defendant's
motion to appoint guardian ad litem, documents of which contain sensitive 10 information that
should have been redacted pursuant to the Court's order (see Doc. 6), serves a compelling 11
interest. The Court further finds that, in the absence of closure, the compelling interests identified
by 12 Defendant in its request would be harmed. In light of the public filing of the redacted
documents (Doc. 13 42), the Court further finds that there are no additional alternatives to sealing
the unredacted filings of the 14 declaration of Defendant's counsel and Exhibits A and B attached
to Defendant's motion to appoint 15 guardian ad litem that would adequately protect the

compelling interests identified by Defendant. 16 Conclusion and Order 17 Accordingly, pursuant to Local Rule 141 and based upon the representations contained in the 18 Defendant's Notice and request (Doc. 41) and amended notice of errata (Doc. 42), IT IS HEREBY 19 ORDERED that the unredacted filings of the declaration of Defendant's counsel and Exhibits A and B 20 attached to Defendant's motion to appoint guardian ad litem (Doc. 39-1 at 1-17) shall be SEALED until 21 further order of this Court; 22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED within (5) days of issuance of this Order, Defendant shall submit a 23 copy of this Order, its Request to Seal Documents, and the unredacted documents to be sealed by email 24 to the Operations Section of the Clerk of the Court: ApprovedSealed@caed.uscourts.gov; and 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28 1 The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to lock and make inaccessible to all CM/ECF users the 2 || Declaration of Deann R. Rivard and attached exhibits (Doc. 39-1). 3 || IT IS SO ORDERED. "|| Dated: _ August 4, 2025 | nnd Rr

5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28