

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division**

RICHARD ROE, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PATRICK M. SHANAHAN, ET AL.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:18-cv-01565

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
FILE UNDER SEAL EXHIBITS A & B TO PLAINTIFFS'
OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION TO DISMISS AND REPLY
IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion to File Under Seal Exhibits A & B to Plaintiffs' Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss and Reply in Support of their Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, this Court GRANTS the motion, FINDING that: (1) Plaintiffs provided sufficient notice of the request; (2) that there are no less drastic alternatives than filing Plaintiffs' declarations under seal along with publicly filed redacted versions; and (3) that there is good cause to keep the pseudonymous Plaintiffs' identities confidential due to the legitimate risk of stigma and discrimination based upon their HIV status if their identities become public. Under such circumstances, where "the public's right of access is outweighed by competing interests," the Court "may, in its discretion, seal documents." In re Knight Pub. Co., 743 F.2d 231, 235 (4th Cir. 1984). This order is consistent with the Court's previous order, ECF No. 42, in which Plaintiffs' exhibits to another motion were filed under seal along with publicly filed redacted versions. Therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED that Exhibits A and B in support of Plaintiffs' Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss and Reply in Support of their Motion for a Preliminary Injunction may remain filed under seal.

Entered this 4th day of February, 2019.

lsl 

Leonie M. Brinkema
United States District Judge

1. The Court has reviewed the proposed order and finds it to be in the best interests of the parties.

2. The Court has also reviewed the proposed order and finds it to be in the best interests of the parties.

3. The Court has also reviewed the proposed order and finds it to be in the best interests of the parties.

4. The Court has also reviewed the proposed order and finds it to be in the best interests of the parties.

1/1
Leonie M. Brinkman
United States District Judge