

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

PAUL BARROWS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAUBERT LAW FIRM LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

ORDER

06-C-409-C

On May 5, 2007, at the parties' request, this court vacated its judgment and dismissed this case with prejudice as part of the parties' global settlement. *See* dkt. 82-83. On June 4, 2007, plaintiff moved for a protective order, asking this court to seal this case file on the ground that "various pleadings" contained "personally identifiable information about plaintiff" that could be used to commit identity theft, or "could be used by media institutions to embarrass plaintiff without proper journalistic reasons." *See* dkt. 84. Defendants respond that they don't object to a general sealing of the file *without* findings by the court, but they will not agree to seal the file for the reasons proffered by plaintiff because plaintiff waited too long and has not laid a proper foundation for his request. *See* dkt. 85.

The law of this circuit forbids this court from entering a blanket protective order for the entire case file, even at the joint request of the parties, without first finding good cause to seal records. *Citizens First Nat'l Bank of Princeton v. Cincinnati Ins. Co.*, 178 F.3d 943, 944-46 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999); *see also Jessup v. Luther*, 277 F.3d 926, 927-28 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2002). So, neither of the parties'

competing proposals passes muster. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion is denied without prejudice. Not later than June 20, 2007, plaintiff may file and serve a new motion that identifies by docket number the specific documents he wishes sealed, along with an explanation why sealing is appropriate. Not later than June 27, 2007, defendants may file a response to this motion. There shall be no reply.

Entered this 13<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER  
Magistrate Judge