

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

A.O.A., et al.)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	Case No.: 4:11 CV 44 CDP
v.)	
)	
IRA L. RENNERT, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiffs' Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Appeal (ECF 1337-1, 1338 (redacted)), and plaintiffs' Motions to File Under Seal (ECF 1336, 1346) wherein plaintiffs move to seal their motion to stay and their reply brief in support. Defendants oppose the motions.

Having fully considered the issues raised by the motions to seal and the respective positions of the parties, I conclude that plaintiffs have provided compelling reasons to seal their motion to stay and their reply brief in support. It is appropriate to seal matters that contain information regarding ongoing criminal investigations that could damage reputations and careers on account of unindicted conduct. *See In re Search Warrant for Secretarial Area Outside Office of Gunn*, 855 F.2d 569, 574 (8th Cir. 1988); *Certain Interested Individuals, John Does I-V, Who Are Emps. of McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Pulitzer Pub. Co.*, 895 F.2d 460, 467 (8th Cir. 1990). I will therefore exercise my discretion and grant plaintiffs' Motions to File Under Seal


for the reasons stated in their motions, and plaintiffs' sealed Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Appeal (ECF 1337-1) and sealed Reply in Support (ECF 1347-1) shall be deemed filed.

Given that plaintiffs' motion to stay is fully briefed, I have also fully considered the parties' respective positions on the issues raised in that motion. Although plaintiffs seek to stay "all" discovery in this case, it appears that the only matter in dispute is the production of notarized Plaintiff Profile Sheets. Plaintiffs' obligation to produce the PPSs in accordance with earlier Orders has existed over a period of years. The interlocutory appeal presently pending before the Eighth Circuit does not change this existing obligation. I will deny the motion to stay.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiffs' Motions to File Under Seal [1336] [1346] are **GRANTED**. Plaintiffs' unredacted Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Appeal (ECF 1337-1) and Reply Brief in Support (ECF 1347-1) are deemed filed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiffs' Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Appeal is **DENIED**.



CATHERINE D. PERRY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 15th day of June, 2023.