

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

RAHINAH IBRAHIM,
Plaintiff,

No. C 06-00545 WHA

v.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, et al.,
Defendants.

**ORDER RE FILING PROPOSED
FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

In December 2013, the parties submitted proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law without proposed redactions. A December 2013 order stated:

Any proposal or response that relies on SSI or any evidence for which privilege was actually sustained on the record as to that evidence must be redacted in the public record but a full and unredacted version must be filed under seal.

(Dkt. No. 652). A January 2010 protective order regarding sensitive security information stated:


Any Party who wishes to use a Restricted Use Document or the Sensitive Security Information contained therein in connection with a motion or other submission to this Court must file the Restricted Use Document and any pleadings, motions or other papers containing Sensitive Security Information under seal. Where possible, only the portions of the filings that contain Sensitive Security Information shall be filed under seal.

(Dkt. No. 312). The parties have yet to file public versions of their proposed findings and responses. Accordingly, the parties shall file (1) public versions of their December 13 proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law with redactions, if any; (2) public versions of their December 20 responses with redactions, if any; and (3) full and unredacted versions of their

1 proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and responses under seal by **NOON ON**
2 **JANUARY 24.**

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: January 15, 2014.



7 WILLIAM ALSUP
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28