

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Abramian v. Taylor

Abramian · No. 1:24-cv-01207-SAB-HC · Decided May 7, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders that Respondent’s request to seal and Exhibit 1 to the notice of filing removal order be sealed until further order. The court limits electronic access to the sealed documents, finds that sealing serves a compelling interest, and directs Respondent to comply with Local Rule 141(e)(2)(i) within two days of service.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	May 7, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-01207-SAB-HC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Order resolving Respondent's request to seal documents filed in a federal habeas proceeding.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Arno Abramian v. Taylor, et al.

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure habeas corpus

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Respondent's request to seal and Exhibit 1 should be sealed under the applicable local rule and the standards governing closure of court records.

HOLDINGS

1. The court ordered Respondent's request to seal and Exhibit 1 sealed until further order because sealing served a compelling interest, disclosure would harm that interest, and no adequate alternative to sealing existed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

- “The Court finds that, for the reasons stated in Respondent’s Request, sealing Respondent’s Request and Exhibit 1 serves a compelling interest.”* (at 1)
- “The Court further finds that, in the absence of closure, the compelling interests identified by Respondent would be harmed.”* (at 1-2)
- “there are no additional alternatives to sealing Respondent’s Request and Exhibit 1 that would adequately protect the compelling interests identified by the Government.”* (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Respondent sought to seal the request to seal and Exhibit 1 to the notice of filing a removal order. The court relied on the representations in the request and found that the materials implicated compelling interests that would be harmed absent sealing. Because the notice to seal had been publicly filed, the court found no adequate alternative to sealing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Respondent filed a notice of filing a removal order, a request to seal, and an exhibit concerning Arno Abramian. The court granted sealing of the request and Exhibit 1, limited electronic access to Respondent and counsel for Petitioner, and directed Respondent to comply with Local Rule 141(e)(2)(i) within two days of service.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Oregonian Publishing Co. v. U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon, 920 F.2d 1462 (9th Cir. 1990)

OPINION

(HC) Abramian v. Taylor

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 ARNO ABRAMIAN, Case No. 1:24-cv-01207-SAB-HC 12 Petitioner, ORDER SEALING

DOCUMENTS AS SET
FORTH IN GOVERNMENT'S NOTICE
13 v. (ECF No. 15) 14 TAYLOR, et al.,
ORDER DIRECTING RESPONDENT TO
15 Respondents. COMPLY WITH LOCAL RULE 141(e)(2)(i)
WITHIN TWO DAYS FROM THE DATE
16 OF SERVICE OF ORDER

17 18 Pursuant to Local Rule 141(b) and based on the representations contained in the 19
Respondent's Request to Seal, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent's Exhibit 1 to its 20
Notice of Filing Removal Order, pertaining to Arno Abramian, and Respondent's Request to 21
Seal shall be SEALED until further order of this Court. 22 It is FURTHER ORDERED that
electronic access to the sealed documents shall be 23 limited to Respondent and counsel for
Petitioner. 24 The Court has considered the factors set forth in *Oregonian Publishing Co. v. U.S.*
25 *District Court for the District of Oregon*, 920 F.2d 1462 (9th Cir. 1990). The Court finds that,
for 26 the reasons stated in Respondent's Request, sealing Respondent's Request and Exhibit 1
serves a 27 compelling interest. The Court further finds that, in the absence of closure, the
compelling interests identified by Respondent would be harmed. In light of the public filing of its
Notice to

—eee mR IIE RII I IID IERIE OEE EEE IDNR IIE

1 | Seal, the Court further finds that there are no additional alternatives to sealing Respondent's 2 |
Request and Exhibit 1 that would adequately protect the compelling interests identified by the 3 |
Government. 4 Respondent is DIRECTED to comply with Local Rule 141(e)(2)(i)! within two
days from 5 | the date of service of this order. 6

| IT IS SO ORDERED. FA. Se

g | Dated: _ May 7, 2025

STANLEY A. BOONE

9 United States Magistrate Judge 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 |1 "Tf the
requesting party is authorized to file electronically, then counsel for the requesting party shall
either e-mail to the Clerk, at the e-mail address for sealed documents listed on the Court's website,
an electronic copy of the 27 documents covered by the sealing order, in .pdf format as an
attachment, or submit to the Clerk by hand-delivery, U.S. mail, or same-day or overnight courier, a
CD containing a copy of the documents in .pdf format." L.R. 141 28 | (e)2yi).