

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

Kristin Della, et al. v. Colgate-Palmolive Company

Della v. Colgate-Palmolive · No. 23-cv-04086-JCS · Decided December 9, 2025

OPINION

Weingartner

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 KRISTIN DELLA, et al., 7 Case No. 23-cv-04086-JCS Plaintiffs, 8

v. ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE

9 MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL

COLGATE-PALMOLIVE COMPANY, UPON RECONSIDERATION

10 Defendant. Re: Dkt. No. 78 11 12 13 The Court previously granted Defendant's Administrative
Motion to File Under Seal, dkt. 14 no 78 ("Motion to Seal") in an order dated December 1, 2025.
See dkt. no. 84. Upon 15 reconsideration, the Motion to Seal is DENIED without prejudice. See
United States v. Vittaly, 16 No. C 04 3186 MHP, 2006 WL 3834229, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 28,
2006) ("A district court . . . 17 has the power to reconsider sua sponte its orders prior to the entry
of judgment."). With respect to 18 the documents Defendant seeks to file in redacted form (the
Declaration of Ronald T. Wilcox, 19 Ph.D., the Declaration of Ran Kivetz, Ph.D., and its
Opposition brief), Defendant did not supply 20 "a proposed order that is narrowly tailored to seal
only the sealable material, and which lists in 21 table format each document or portion thereof that
is sought to be sealed." Civ.L.R. 79- 22 5(c)(3) (emphasis added). Instead, the table in the
proposed order (dkt. no. 78-2) lists only the two 23 documents Defendant asks the Court to seal in
their entirety (Exhibit F to the Declaration of Greg 24 Corra in support of Colgate's Opposition to
Class Certification and Exhibit P to the Omnibus 25 Declaration of Kate T. Spelman). 26
Furthermore, Defendant did not provide in unredacted form either of the two exhibits 27 sought to
be sealed, instead filing in support of the Motion to Seal placeholder face pages for the 1 ("Where
the document to be sealed is a declaration or an exhibit to a document filed 2 || electronically, an
otherwise blank page reading "EXHIBIT FILED UNDER SEAL" shall replace 3 the exhibit in the
document filed on the public docket, and the exhibit to be filed under seal 4 || shall be filed
separately as an attachment to the Administrative Motion to File Under Seal.") 5 (emphasis
added). 6 Therefore, the Motion to Seal is DENIED without prejudice to filing a renewed sealing
7 motion that corrects these errors. 8 IT IS SO ORDERED. 9 10 Dated: December 9, 2025 11

J PH C. SPERO

12 nited States Magistrate Judge © 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/kristin-della-et-al-v-colgate-palmolive-company-movu49s0>