

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

R.M. v. Warden of the Golden State Annex Detention Facility, et al.

R.M. · No. 1:25-cv-1607 TLN AC P · Decided January 9, 2026

OPINION

R.M. v. Warden of the Golden State Annex Detention Facility, et al.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 R.M., No. 1:25-cv-1607 TLN AC P 12 Petitioner, 13 v. ORDER

14 WARDEN OF THE GOLDEN STATE

ANNEX DETENTION FACILITY, et al., 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner, proceeding through
counsel, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus 18 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Currently
before the court are petitioner’s motion to proceed 19 pseudonymously and for a protective order
and motion to seal a medical report.¹ ECF Nos. 16, 20 17, 19. Both motions are unopposed. 21 In
the motion to proceed pseudonymously, petitioner asserts that they are an asylum 22 seeker and
are requesting to proceed using only their initials due to the risk of retaliatory harm. 23 ECF No.
16. Parties are permitted “to use pseudonyms in the ‘unusual case’ when nondisclosure 24 of the
party’s identity ‘is necessary . . . to protect a person from harassment, injury, ridicule or 25
personal embarrassment.’” Does I through XXIII v. Advanced Textile Corp., 214 F.3d 1058, 26
1067-68 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting United States v. Doe, 655 F.2d 920, 922 n. 1 (9th Cir. 1981)). 27
28 1 The pending motion to dismiss will be addressed by separate findings and recommendations.
1 The need for anonymity is determined by evaluating (1) “the severity of the threatened harm,”
(2) 2 the reasonableness of the fears, (3) and the individual’s vulnerability to retaliation. Id. at
1068 3 (citations omitted). 4 The court has reviewed petitioner’s motion and finds that the reasons
for proceeding under 5 a pseudonym warrant granting of the motion, and the need for
confidentiality in asylum cases has 6 been recognized by the government, see 8 C.F.R. § 208.6
(regarding disclosure of records in 7 asylum proceedings). Moreover, petitioner’s identity has not
been withheld from respondent, and 8 having no opposition from respondent, the undersigned
finds that respondent would not suffer 9 any prejudice from allowing petitioner to be identified by
their initials rather than their full name. 10 The motion to proceed under a pseudonym will
therefore be granted. 11 Petitioner also requests a protective order requiring that the parties either
redact or file 12 under seal any information identifying petitioner; the motion does not identify the
scope of the 13 personal information for which protection is sought. Considering that this request

was made in 14 conjunction with the request to proceed pseudonymously, the court will construe it a request 15 related to the use of petitioner's full name. The request will be granted to the extent that the 16 parties shall be required to refer to petitioner as either "petitioner" or by initials, and they shall 17 redact any documents containing petitioner's full name. If petitioner wishes to protect any other 18 specific information or have any documents already filed in this action sealed, they may file a 19 motion identifying the type of information they seek to protect or identifying the documents they 20 wish to seal. Such motion must identify the reasons for sealing and specify whether they seek to 21 seal the entire document or only a portion. In the event petitioner seeks to seal only a portion of a 22 document, they will be required to submit a redacted version for public filing.² 23 Petitioner has also filed a motion to seal a medical report. ECF Nos. 17, 19. There is "a 24 strong presumption in favor of access to court records." *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 25 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003) (citations omitted). "A party seeking to seal a judicial record 26 then bears the burden of overcoming this strong presumption by meeting the 'compelling reasons' 27 2 Due to the nature of this case, access to public filings are restricted to the parties and the public 28 terminals located at the courthouse. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(c). 1 || standard." *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (citation omitted). 2 || The undersigned has reviewed the medical report petitioner wishes to file under seal? and finds 3 || that the sensitive nature of the materials, combined with the concerns of retaliatory harm outlined 4 || more fully in petitioner's motion for a protective order, constitute compelling reasons to seal the 5 || report and the motion will be granted. 6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 7 1. Petitioner's motion to proceed pseudonymously and for protective order (ECF No. 16) 8 || is GRANTED to the extent set forth above; 9 2. The parties must redact or move to file under seal any information identifying 10 || petitioner under seal, as outlined above; 11 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to update the docket to identify petitioner as 12 | "R.M."; and 13 4. Petitioner's request to file under seal (ECF No. 17, 19) is GRANTED and petitioner 14 || may file his eleven-page medical report under seal. After adding consecutive pagination to the 15 || medical report, petitioner shall submit the report to the Clerk of the Court for filing in accordance 16 || with Local Rule 141(e)(2)(i). 17 | DATED: January 8, 2026 ~ Ig Chthion— Chore ALLISON CLAIRE 19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 Q_—_ xj dd > The court notes that the report is not paginated consecutively as required by Local Rule 141(b). 28 | Petitioner will be required add such pagination prior to submitting the report for filing.