

1 Jacqueline Arkush (SBN 365861)
 2 jarkush@publicjustice.net
 3 Leslie Bailey (SBN 232690)
 4 lbailey@publicjustice.net
 5 PUBLIC JUSTICE
 6 475 14th St., Suite 610
 7 Oakland, CA 94612
 8 Telephone: (510) 622-8150

9
 10 *Counsel for Proposed Intervenors*
 11 *Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice,*
 12 *First Amendment Coalition,*
 13 *Los Angeles Public Press, and*
 14 *The Southlander*

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

16 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 HUGO GONZALEZ, et al., on behalf of
 18 themselves and all others similarly
 19 situated,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 The GEO Group, Inc., et al.

23 Defendant.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-04014-JGB-ACCV

**PROPOSED INTERVENORS’
 REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
 MOTION TO UNSEAL COURT
 RECORDS**

Date: March 30, 2026

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 1 (Riverside)

Judge: Hon. Jesus G. Bernal

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

ARGUMENT..... 1

 I. GEO STILL HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THAT ANY
 COMPELLING REASON OUTWEIGHS THE PUBLIC’S
 RIGHT OF ACCESS. 1

 A. GEO Cannot Rely on the Court’s Previous Orders
 Granting the Requests to Seal..... 1

 B. GEO’s Alleged “Compelling Reasons” Do Not Justify
 Such Broad Sealing..... 3

 1. GEO Has Not Established that Unsealing Will Harm
 Anyone’s Safety or
 Security..... 4

 2. None of GEO’s Arguments About Purported Privacy
 Interests is Persuasive..... 7

 C. GEO Minimizes the Public’s Interest, Which is Significant
 and Growing. 10

CONCLUSION..... 12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

CASES	PAGE(S)
<i>ACLU v. DHS</i> , 738 F. Supp. 2d 93 (D.D.C. 2010).....	6
<i>Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. McAleenan</i> , No. 17-CV-02366-BAS-KSC, 2019 WL 6220898 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2019).....	6, 10
<i>Apple Inc. v. Psystar Corp.</i> , 658 F.3d 1150 (9th Cir. 2011).....	2
<i>Courthouse News Service v. Planet</i> , 947 F.3d 581 (9th Cir. 2020).....	10, 11
<i>Fernandez v. Duarte</i> , No. 3:22-CV-00446-BAS-VET, 2025 WL 77056 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2025).....	5
<i>Greer v. Cty. of San Diego</i> , No. 19-CV-378-JO-DEB, 2023 WL 4479234 (S.D. Cal. July 10, 2023).....	3
<i>Hernandez v. Cnty. of Monterey</i> , 2023 WL 5418753 (N.D. Cal. 2023).....	10
<i>In re Facebook, Inc. Internet Tracking Litig.</i> , 956 F.3d 589 (9th Cir. 2020).....	8
<i>Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu</i> , 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006).....	passim
<i>Oregonian Pub. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for Dist. of Or.</i> , 920 F.2d 1462 (9th Cir. 1990).....	3
<i>Perez v. City of Fresno</i> , 482 F. Supp. 3d 1037 (E.D. Cal. 2020).....	8, 9
<i>Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n</i> , 605 F.3d 665 (9th Cir. 2010).....	2
<i>Ramirez v. GEO Group</i> , No. 18CV2136-LAB (MSB), 2019 WL 6782920 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2019).....	5

1 *Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia*,
448 U.S. 555 (1980) 12

2

3 *TML Recovery, LLC v. Cigna Corp.*,
714 F. Supp. 3d 1214 (C.D. Cal. 2024) 11

4 *United States v. Gen. Motors Corp.*,
99 F.R.D. 610 (D.D.C. 1983)..... 4

5

6 *United States v. Schlette*,
842 F.2d 1574 (9th Cir.), *amended*, 854 F.2d 359 (9th Cir. 1988)..... 8

7 *United States v. Seugasala*,
670 F. App’x 641 (9th Cir. 2016) 3

8

9 **RULES**

9 Local Rule 79-5.2.2(a)(ii) 10

10 Local Rule 79-7.2 3

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

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

INTRODUCTION

Proposed Intervenor seek to unseal records of significant public interest that document alleged misconduct and mismanagement of Adelanto ICE Processing Center (“Adelanto”) by GEO Group, Inc. (“GEO”). GEO continues to insist that vague arguments about “safety” and “security” justify sealing over 900 pages of documents and dozens of videos in their entirety. They seek to distract from this fundamental error by making unsupported legal claims, mischaracterizing Proposed Intervenor’s arguments, misrepresenting what is contained in the records that Proposed Intervenor are seeking to unseal, and attempting to minimize the significance of the public’s interest in the court records at issue. Ultimately, GEO has not met their burden. Accordingly, Proposed Intervenor’s motion to unseal (Dkt. 122-1) should be granted.

ARGUMENT

I. GEO STILL HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THAT ANY COMPELLING REASON OUTWEIGHS THE PUBLIC’S RIGHT OF ACCESS.

A. GEO Cannot Rely on the Court’s Previous Orders Granting the Requests to Seal.

GEO argues that Proposed Intervenor “have not and cannot meet their burden to disturb the Court’s prior sealing orders.” Dkt. 125 at 3, 5. GEO apparently reasons that, because the Court granted the previous sealing applications, the burden now shifts to Proposed Intervenor to demonstrate a compelling reason to *unseal*. *Id.* at 1–5. But the Ninth Circuit has rejected this “upside down” approach, explaining in *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, that the burden of justifying secrecy belongs to the proponent alone. 447 F.3d 1172, 1182 (9th Cir. 2006). The

1 burden of establishing compelling reasons for sealing remains with GEO. *See* Dkt.
2 122-1.

3 In any event, this Court’s sealing orders do not demonstrate that GEO
4 previously met their burden of providing compelling reasons for sealing that
5 outweigh the public’s interest. First, as Proposed Intervenors previously explained
6 (Dkt. 122-1 at 20–21, 24), this Court’s sealing orders fail “to articulate the factual
7 basis for [the] ruling,” as is required by well-established law that GEO itself cites.
8 Dkt. 125 at 4 (citing *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 679 (9th Cir.
9 2010)); *see Pintos*, 605 F.3d at 679 (“An order that fails to articulate its reasoning
10 must be vacated and remanded because ‘meaningful appellate review is
11 impossible.’”); *accord Apple Inc. v. Psystar Corp.*, 658 F.3d 1150, 1162 (9th Cir.
12 2011). Here, the Court’s sealing orders are just like those vacated by the Ninth
13 Circuit in *Pintos* for lack of factual support and legal reasoning. 605 F.3d at 678–
14 80. In one instance, Dkt. 61, the Court’s conclusion that sealing was warranted is
15 also wrong because the Court applied “good cause” rather than the correct¹
16 “compelling reason” standard. Dkt. 122-1 at 11 (explaining why the “compelling
17 reason” standard” applies); *see Pintos*, 605 F.3d at 678–79 (remanding with
18 instructions to apply higher “compelling reasons” standard). Because the Court’s
19 orders granting the sealing motions are plainly deficient, GEO’s reliance on them
20 is unreasonable.

21
22

23 ¹ GEO has not and does not argue that “good cause” applies to any of the materials,
24 thus conceding that compelling reason is the standard for sealing related to summary
judgment and class certification. Dkt. 60 at 2–3; Dkt. 71 at 2–3; Dkt. 125 at 4–5.

1 Second, even if GEO had previously met their burden to seal, even well-
2 supported sealing orders are routinely revisited. *See United States v. Seugasala*, 670
3 F. App'x 641–42 (9th Cir. 2016) (“[d]istrict courts have inherent discretionary
4 power to seal or unseal record items.”); L.R. 79-7.2 (recognizing process for
5 nonparties to request unsealing). “[A]ny purported reliance . . . on the continued
6 sealing of the [documents] is unreasonable given well-established principles of
7 open access to the court.” *Greer v. Cty. of San Diego*, No. 19-CV-378-JO-DEB,
8 2023 WL 4479234, at *4 (S.D. Cal. July 10, 2023), reversed on other grounds.
9 Therefore, GEO “should have been aware that,” even after motions to seal have
10 been granted by the court, “a third party may seek to intervene to unseal litigation
11 documents.” *Id.*

12 **B. GEO’s Alleged “Compelling Reasons” Do Not Justify Such Broad**
13 **Sealing**

14 GEO offers only two justifications for sealing, abandoning a prior argument
15 that protecting their competitive advantage was a compelling reason to seal.² First,
16 they argue that documents that implicate “security and safety risks” should remain
17 sealed. Dkt. 125 at 6–11. Second, they argue that documents that implicate
18 employees’ or detained people’s privacy rights should remain sealed. *Id.* at 11–14.
19 As explained below, GEO cannot justify their sweeping approach because neither
20 of GEO’s reasons is sufficiently compelling to overcome the public’s interest in
21 access to the records. *See Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1183–84; *Oregonian Pub. Co. v.*
22 *U.S. Dist. Ct. for Dist. of Oregon*, 920 F.2d 1462, 1467 (9th Cir. 1990) (holding that

23 ² In a footnote, GEO argues in passing that “revealing sensitive business information,
24 including the internal operations of the Facility, would also harm GEO’s competitive
standing.” Dkt. 125 at 6–7 n.3. GEO has not developed that argument or presented a
factual basis in support of it. Dkt. 122-1 at 16–19.

1 the First Amendment right of access places the burden on the proponent of secrecy
2 to “demonstrat[e] that any available alternatives will not protect [their] interests.”)

3 **1. GEO Has Not Established that Unsealing Will Harm Anyone’s**
4 **Safety or Security.**

5 GEO has submitted a ten-page declaration in support of their opposition.
6 Because much of it is redacted, Proposed Intervenors cannot determine whether
7 GEO has met their burden. *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1184 (“[s]imply mentioning a
8 general category of privilege, without . . . specific linkage with the documents, does
9 not satisfy the burden.”) But based on the argument presented in their brief, GEO
10 continues to rely on hypothetical harms and conjecture. *Id.* at 1179 (sealing cannot
11 “rely[] on hypothesis or conjecture”). For example, they repeat the mantra that
12 every group of documents “would provide insight into [Adelanto’s] security
13 measures and protocol, compromise the safety . . . and frustrate” their ability to
14 safely manage Adelanto. Dkt. 125 at 7–10. The lack of differentiation between the
15 disparate materials demonstrates they have not and cannot meet their burden.
16 *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1182 (“conclusory offerings do not rise to the level of
17 “compelling reasons”). For Document No. 60, all GEO argues is that disclosing
18 water temperature tests “would come entirely without context, doing little more
19 than gratify [sic] public spite and promote [sic] public scandal.” Dkt. 125 at 10. The
20 lawsuit provides the context and GEO’s vague fear about how the information may
21 be received by the public is not a compelling reason to seal. *See United States v.*
22 *Gen. Motors Corp.*, 99 F.R.D. 610, 612 (D.D.C. 1983) (proponent’s claimed
23 inability to “contradict or explain what it believes [are] misleading inferences” prior
24 to disclosure does not “justify concealing” presumptively public court records).

1 GEO relies on three main cases, all are unpersuasive or distinguishable Dkt.
2 125 at 6. In *Fernandez*, defendants sought to seal information relating to an
3 institutional policy restricting correspondence between incarcerated people with
4 known gang affiliations, and to security risks that were unique to the plaintiff.
5 *Fernandez v. Duarte*, No. 3:22-CV-00446-BAS-VET, 2025 WL 77056, at *1 (S.D.
6 Cal. Jan. 10, 2025). The court concluded, without analysis, that the information
7 could, if disclosed, create a significant security threat or jeopardize institutional
8 security. *Id.* at *2. *Fernandez* is no more than an example of a court determining
9 that protecting institutional safety can be a compelling interest that outweighs the
10 presumption of access. *Id.* Nothing in it demands the broad sealing GEO asks for
11 here. In fact, it undermines their broad requests; the *Fernandez* court noted that
12 defendants “reasonably limited the request” to small portions “that may implicate
13 safety concerns.” *Id.* at *2.

14 In *Ramirez*, the parties jointly moved to seal certain of GEO’s policies and
15 procedures, which the parties argued “directly impact[ed]” safety. *Ramirez v. GEO*
16 *Group*, No. 18CV2136-LAB (MSB), 2019 WL 6782920 at *3 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 11,
17 2019). Without engaging in any factual analysis, the court concluded that there was
18 good cause to seal the documents. *Id.* Further, the *Ramirez* court’s analysis was
19 incomplete because it did not weigh the interest in sealing against the public’s
20 interest in the materials. *See id.* Notably, the documents at issue were not central to
21 the adjudication of the plaintiff’s claims. *See id.* at *1, 3. Thus, *Ramirez* offers this
22 Court very little guidance. Finally, *ACLU* is inapposite. There, the court declined to
23 disclose a single page of records because it was protected by a Freedom of
24 Information Act exemption, which is not a basis for sealing in the Ninth Circuit.

1 *Compare ACLU v. DHS*, 738 F. Supp. 2d 93, 119 (D.D.C. 2010) *with Kamakana*,
2 447 F.3d at 1185 (“[n]either will it suffice to show . . . that a document merits
3 sealing because it would be exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of
4 Information Act.”)

5 It is also worth noting that GEO misrepresents the contents of some records.
6 Because of their accidental public filing of certain exhibits at Dkt. 60-4, Proposed
7 Intervenors can compare GEO’s description of the records with their actual
8 contents. GEO claims that the CERT plan (Doc. No. 22) describes emergency action
9 plans, officer movements, the number of officers that will respond, and “exit and
10 entry controls.” Dkt. 125 at 9. But upon review, the plan only provides options for
11 what management and supervisors can do in certain scenarios. There is no set
12 number for how many CERT team members should respond, and there is no
13 mention of controlling exits and entries. Rather than a rigid and predictable
14 “security protocol,” the plan gives discretion to the responders on the scene.³ *Id.*
15 Because the document does not “reveal[] the location of agents such that certain
16 areas . . . would be susceptible to security breaches if the information was
17 disclosed,” sealing is not warranted. *Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. McAleenan*, No. 17-CV-
18 02366-BAS-KSC, 2019 WL 6220898, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2019).

19 GEO’s description of the Shift Summaries (Doc. No. 34) as “showing when
20 detention officers check rooms” is similarly misleading. Dkt. 125 at 9. The
21 summaries merely break down the inspections by first, second, and third shift. Even

22 _____
23 ³ The discretion is highlighted by GEO in their motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 63 at
24 3–4 (“Once activated, the CERT commander has independent authority to determine the
team’s tactics as well as the level and amount of force used, if any, in response to the
circumstances.”)

1 if specifics were given, it is hard to see how disclosing the time that a daily
2 inspection took place nearly six years ago “would pose a security risk to detainees,
3 officers, and [Adelanto] itself.” *Id.* Indeed, GEO’s lack of urgency in removing the
4 documents from the public docket, including the entire roster of people detained,
5 shows that GEO’s stated concerns are rhetorical.

6 GEO also claims that “[t]he sealed records reflect information not otherwise
7 available on the public docket and not disclosed publicly.” Dkt. 125 at 2. However,
8 GEO itself has described many operational procedures in detail, including “the
9 timing and frequency of counts” and “the protocols and techniques used by
10 detention officers during the June 12, 2020 incident” (Dkt. 125 at 7–8). Dkt. 63 at
11 5–11. In their summary judgment briefs, GEO disclosed the number of CERT
12 officers present, multiple detention officers’ names, the techniques and weapons
13 they employed, and the strategy behind their progression through the dorms. *E.g.*,
14 Dkt. 63 at 9–13; Dkt. 63-1 ¶¶ 91–114. The accompanying exhibits include
15 depositions and GEO’s count policy itself, which both provide a significant amount
16 of detail. *E.g.*, Dkt. 63-2, Ex. 29 (GEO Detainee Count Procedures Policy). Given
17 these discrepancies in GEO’s representations, Proposed Intervenors respectfully
18 request that this Court carefully scrutinize whether the documents contain the
19 information that GEO alleges they do.

20 **2. None of GEO’s Arguments About Purported Privacy Interests**
21 **is Persuasive**

22 GEO argues that sealing is warranted to protect Plaintiffs’ and detention
23 officers’ privacy interests. Dkt. 125 at 11–14. Generally, the “right
24 to privacy ‘encompass[es] the individual’s control of information concerning his or
her person.’” *In re Facebook, Inc. Internet Tracking Litig.*, 956 F.3d 589, 598 (9th

1 Cir. 2020) (quoting *U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the*
2 *Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 763 (1989)); *United States v. Schlette*, 842 F.2d 1574, 1581
3 (9th Cir.), *amended*, 854 F.2d 359 (9th Cir. 1988) (“privacy interests are personal
4 to the [person whose records are at issue].”) When a party whose privacy interests
5 are implicated either seeks or does not oppose disclosure, their interest is waived.
6 *Perez v. City of Fresno*, 482 F. Supp. 3d 1037, 1044 (E.D. Cal. 2020).

7 **Plaintiffs’ Privacy Interests.** This Court need not consider whether
8 disclosure of any document Proposed Intervenors seek to unseal would infringe on
9 Plaintiffs’ privacy rights because Plaintiffs have waived those rights explicitly:
10 Plaintiffs actively opposed GEO’s broad invocation of their privacy for most of the
11 materials that Proposed Intervenors now seek to unseal. Dkt. 60 at 2, 4; Dkt. 70 at
12 1; Dkt. 71-1, Ex. A at 1.⁴ Plaintiffs have also waived their privacy rights by choosing
13 to not oppose Proposed Intervenors’ request. *See Perez*, 482 F. Supp. 3d at 1044.

14 It is worth noting that GEO repeatedly claims that Proposed Intervenors are
15 attempting to release the personal identifying information of people that were
16 detained at Adelanto in June 2020. *E.g.*, Dkt. 125 at 11. As was made clear in the
17 motion to unseal, that is simply not true. Dkt. 122-1 at 7. Proposed Intervenors are
18 explicitly *not* seeking to unseal the few exhibits for which Plaintiffs asserted their
19 own right to privacy. Dkt. 122-3; Ex. A, Approximated Chart.

20 **Detention officers’ privacy interests.** GEO asserts their employees’ privacy
21 interests with regard to two categories of information: videos and documents

22 _____
23 ⁴ Plaintiffs’ counsel stated via email that they “opposed the blanket sealing” and believed
24 only a few lines within the hundreds of pages warranted redaction because they contained
private information about people detained. *Id.*

1 presumably containing the names of individual officers. Without citing any
2 authority, GEO claims that their detention officers’ “interest in privacy would be
3 frustrated” by the disclosure of video showing “their faces and actions.” Dkt. 125
4 at 12. This Court should consider this alleged privacy interest in the same way as
5 the court in *Perez v. City of Fresno* did. See 482 F. Supp. 3d at 1044–48. In *Perez*,
6 the surviving family members of a person killed by police sought to disclose body-
7 camera footage of his death to “educate the public” about police brutality. *Id.* at
8 1045. The faces of police officers and nonparty private employees of a defendant—
9 the “exclusive provider of ambulance services” for the county—were visible, but
10 no names or “typically-protected private information” was disclosed in the footage.
11 *Id.* at 1041, 1044. First, the court found a weak privacy interest because “far from
12 being private, disconnected bystanders,” the private employees were “included in
13 this video because of their professional assistance of public officers, and their direct
14 involvement in restraining Mr. Perez.” *Id.* at 1044–45. Then, the court found that
15 plaintiffs’ “desire to educate the public about issues involving public officers”
16 supported disclosure, where the video went to “issues are at the forefront of public
17 discourse at this time in this country.” *Id.* at 1045. Finally, because “recent public
18 discussion . . . has shown that video footage facilitates public discourse in a way
19 that print descriptions do not,” the public interest in disclosure triumphed. *Id.* at
20 1048. Here, where the conduct of government contractors is at issue, the public
21 interest should similarly prevail.

22 GEO also seeks to protect employees’ names and email addresses, claiming
23 that disclosure “may subject them to violence, public humiliation, and other harms.”
24 Dkt. 125 at 11. GEO provides no factual basis for this argument, and thus has not

1 met their burden of demonstrating that sealing employees’ names or email addresses
2 is justified. Further, GEO has also not explained why redaction of names and emails
3 is insufficient to protect any privacy interests at stake, as the courts did in both cases
4 GEO relies on. *See Hernandez v. Cnty. of Monterey*, 2023 WL 5418753, at *3 (N.D.
5 Cal. 2023) (allowing redaction of several nonparty staff names); *Al Otro Lado, Inc.*,
6 2019 WL 6220898, at *4 (allowing redaction of Customs and Borden Patrol
7 officers’ phone numbers, but not of their names or email addresses). As the
8 proponent of secrecy, GEO must provide this Court with proposed orders “narrowly
9 tailored to seal only the sealable material.” L.R. 79-5.2.2(a)(ii). Anything less is
10 unjustifiable under the First Amendment. *See Courthouse News Service v. Planet*,
11 947 F.3d 581, 594–96 (9th Cir. 2020) (holding that restrictions on the First
12 Amendment right of access to civil court records must be narrowly tailored).

13 **C. GEO Minimizes the Public’s Interest, Which is Significant and**
14 **Growing.**

15 GEO attempts to diminish the public’s interest in access to strengthen their
16 weak arguments by comparison. They contradict themselves in the process. In their
17 opposition to the motion to intervene, GEO claims “[g]eneralized curiosity or
18 interest in detention-related oversight” does not outweigh their reliance on the
19 orders and the resulting prejudice they will suffer as a party “in a private civil
20 action.” Dkt. 124 at 4–5. Meanwhile, in their opposition to the motion to unseal,
21 they heavily invoke “the federal government’s interest” to justify sealing records.
22 Dkt. 125 at 7–10. GEO even claims, without support, that national security is at
23 stake. Dkt. 125 at 4. Proposed Intervenors’ motions thoroughly discuss the
24 significance and extent of GEO’s relationship to the federal government and will
not rehash it here. Dkt. 121-1 at 1–2; Dkt. 122-1 at 21–24. GEO cannot have their

1 cake and eat it too; they can't be a private litigant in one context and a public
2 contractor in another. The public's right of access applies in any event. *See TML*
3 *Recovery, LLC v. Cigna Corp.*, 714 F. Supp. 3d 1214, 1222 (C.D. Cal. 2024)
4 (“[p]ublic scrutiny is a cost that private litigants routinely must bear in exchange
5 for access to public courts”)

6 Further, they wrongly equate public scandal with public scrutiny. Dkt. 125 at
7 5. GEO asserts that their involvement with the federal government makes the
8 possibility of “public scandal . . . especially true in this context,” and sufficient to
9 outweigh the public's interest. *Id.* But there is a difference between unwarranted
10 scandal and genuine public concern. Here, Proposed Intervenors seek to “to enable
11 free and informed discussion about important issues of the day and governmental
12 affair.” *Courthouse News Serv.*, 947 F.3d at 589. And public access ultimately
13 benefits “the administration of justice.” *Id.* (quoting *Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn*, 420
14 U.S. 469, 492 (1975)). Facilitating critical analysis of the judicial system and public
15 officials is not a byproduct of the right of access, but its central purpose. That is
16 why “[t]he mere fact that the production of records may lead to a litigant's
17 embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to further litigation” is not a compelling
18 reason to seal, *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179, and why GEO's argument that
19 transparency will cause public scandal carries no weight.

20 The well-established reason for the right of access also makes GEO's claim
21 that disclosure “may further undermine trust between immigrant communities and
22 law enforcement” specious. Dkt. 125 at 11–12. It is the lack of transparency that
23 “may undermine public confidence [because when the process is] concealed from
24 public view an unexpected [legal] outcome can cause a reaction that the system at

1 best has failed and at worst has been corrupted.” *Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v.*
2 *Virginia*, 448 U.S. 555, 571–72 (1980). The consistent attempts of elected
3 government officials to improve oversight of Adelanto demonstrate that there is
4 strong desire for transparency from GEO.⁵ The continued deaths of people detained
5 at Adelanto, including one since GEO filed their opposition,⁶ demonstrate that “the
6 system at best has failed.” *Id.*

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 GEO has failed to prove that compelling reasons for sealing exist, or that
9 those alleged reasons outweigh the public’s well-established right to access the
10 court records at issue here, which are of significant public interest. Accordingly,
11 Proposed Intervenors request that the Court (1) unseal records for which there are
12 no compelling reasons for secrecy, and (2) issue orders that articulate the factual
13 basis for sealing any information that is to remain under seal.

14 Dated: March 9, 2026

Submitted,

15 PUBLIC JUSTICE

16 /s/ Jacqueline Arkush

Jacqueline Arkush (SBN 365861)

17 Leslie Bailey (SBN 232690)

18 *Counsel for Proposed Intervenors*
19
20

21 _____
22 ⁵ Ruben Vives, *33 People Died in ICE Custody Last Year, Lawmaker Wants to Make*
California Detention Centers Accountable, LA Times (March 6, 2026),
23 <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2026-03-06/lawmaker-proposes-fines-for-noncompliant-immigration-detention-centers>.

24 ⁶ Izzy Ramirez, *Los Angeles Father Dies Under ICE Custody – 9th Death This Year*, L.A. Taco (Feb. 28, 2026), <https://lataco.com/los-angeles-father-dies-ice-9th-death>.

Exhibit A

<u>Motion for Class Certification, Dkt. 54</u>			
Doc. No.	Contents	Former Ex. No. (<i>approx.</i>)¹	Proponent of Sealing
54	Roster ²	Ex. 1	GEO and Plaintiffs. Proposed Intervenor do not seek to unseal this record.
1	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	GEO
2	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
3	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
4	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
5	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
6	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
9	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
10	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
11	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
12	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
13	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
14	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
15	Video	<i>Exs. 2 through 8</i>	
16	Count Slips	<i>Ex. 9</i>	
17	Officer Log	Ex. 10	
18	Grievances	<i>Ex. 11</i>	
19	Incident Reports	Ex. 12	
20	Emails	Ex. 15	
21	Emails	Ex. 16	

¹ Italicization of former exhibit number indicates an approximation based on available information. All other former exhibit numbers were clear from their description in GEO’s opposition, e.g. CERT plan, or were confirmed via email by GEO counsel.

² Document No. 54 refers to the roster of people detained, which was filed multiple times under different exhibit numbers, but appears to have been consolidated under one document number.

<u>Motion for Summary Judgment, Dkt. 63</u>			
Doc. No.	Contents	Former Ex. No. (approx.)	Proponent of Sealing
22	CERT Plan	Ex. 5	GEO
23	Officer Log	Ex. 16	
24	Video	Ex. 19	
25	Video	Ex. 20	
26	Video	Ex. 21	
27	Video	Ex. 22	
28	Incident Reports	Ex. 23	
30	Video	Ex. 30	
31	Video	Ex. 31	
32	Video	Ex. 32	
33	Video	Ex. 33	
34	Shift Summaries	Ex. 37	
35	ESI Excerpts	Ex. 38	
N/A ³	Hugo Gonzalez File	Ex. 41	
N/A	Jose Baca File	Ex. 43	
N/A	Erick Lopez File	Ex. 45	
N/A	Mario Manjarrez File	Ex. 47	
N/A	Ricardo Sandoval Guardarrama File	Ex. 49	
36	Video	Ex. 50	GEO
37	Video	Ex. 51	
38	Video	Ex. 52	
39	Video	Ex. 53	
40	Video	Ex. 54	
41	Video	Ex. 55	
42	Video	Ex. 56	
43	Video	Ex. 57	
44	Video	Ex. 58	
45	Video	Ex. 59	
46	Video	Ex. 60	
47	Video	Ex. 61	

³ Some exhibits were not mentioned in GEO’s opposition to unsealing (Dkt. 125) and Proposed Intervenor are unaware of their document numbers.

<u>Motion for Summary Judgment, cont.</u>			
Doc. No.	Contents	Former Ex. No. (<i>approx.</i>)	Proponent of Sealing
48	Video	<i>Ex. 62</i>	GEO
49	Video	<i>Ex. 63</i>	
50	Video	<i>Ex. 64</i>	

<u>Opposition to Class Certification, Dkt. 72</u>			
Doc. No.	Contents	Former Ex. No. (<i>approx.</i>)	Proponent of Sealing
51	Officer Log	<i>Ex. 70</i>	GEO
52	Video	<i>Ex. 71</i>	
53	Video	<i>Ex. 72</i>	
54	Roster	<i>Ex. 74</i>	GEO and Plaintiffs. Proposed Intervenor do not seek to unseal this record.

<u>Opposition to Summary Judgment, Dkt. 84</u>			
Doc. No.	Contents	Former Ex. No. (<i>approx.</i>)	Proponent of Sealing
55	Email	<i>Ex. 87</i>	GEO
56	Officer Log	<i>Ex. 90</i>	
57	Grievances	<i>Ex. 92</i>	GEO and Plaintiffs. Proposed Intervenor do not seek to unseal this record.
58	DHS Doc	<i>Ex. 93</i>	GEO
59	"Internal Doc"	<i>Ex. 98</i>	
60	Water Temp	<i>Ex. 99</i>	
61	Email	Duplicate <i>Ex. 87</i>	
62	Officer Log	Duplicate <i>Ex. 90</i>	GEO and Plaintiffs. Proposed Intervenor do not seek to unseal this record.
63	Grievances	Duplicate <i>Ex. 92</i>	
64	DHS Doc	Duplicate <i>Ex. 93</i>	GEO
65	"Internal Doc"	Duplicate <i>Ex. 98</i>	
66	Water Temp	Duplicate <i>Ex. 99</i>	