1	Gregory H. Guillot		
2	ggmark@radix.net Admitted Pro Hac Vice		
2	GREGORY H. GUILLOT, P.C.		
3	13455 Noel Road, Suite 1000		
4	Dallas, TX 75240 Telephone: (972) 774-4560		
-	Facsimile: (214) 515-0411		
5			
6	John L. Krieger, (Nevada Bar No. 6023) JKrieger@LRLaw.com		
0	LEWIS AND ROCA LLP		
7	3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600 Las Vegas, NV 89169		
8	Telephone: (702) 949-8200		
-	Facsimile: (702) 949-8389		
9			
10	George L. Paul GPaul@LRLaw.com		
10	Admitted Pro Hac Vice		
11	Robert H. McKirgan,		
10	<u>RMckirgan@LRLaw.com</u>		
12	Admitted Pro Hac Vice LEWIS AND ROCA LLP		
13	40 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900		
_	Phoenix, AZ 85004		
14			
15	Facsimile: (602) 734-3857		
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff,		
16	DONNĂ CORBELLO		
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
18	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
19	DONNA CORBELLO, an individual,		
		Case No. 2:08-cv-00867-RCJ-PAL	
20	Plaintiff,	FOR LEAVE	
21	VS.	TO FILE UNDER SEAL CERTAIN EXHIBITS TO HER RESPONSE TO	
22	THOMAS GAETANO DEVITO, an	DEFENDANT JERSEY BOYS	
23	individual, <i>et al.</i> ,	RECORDS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP'S MOTION FOR	
24	Defendants.	SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND CROSS- MOTION TO COMPEL	
25		JURISDICTIONAL DISCOVERY	
26			
27	Plaintiff Donna Corbello, by her attorneys, and pursuant to the Stipulated Protective		
28	Order (Doc. 94) entered into by the parties, and the Court's Protective Order Governing		

*Confidentiality of Documents* entered on January 5, 2009 ("Order Regarding Sealing
 Requirements") (Doc. 95), herewith requests leave to file certain documents under seal as
 exhibits to Plaintiff's Response to Jersey Boys Records Limited Partnership's Motion for
 Summary Judgment and Cross-Motion to Compel Responses to Jurisdictional Discovery
 ("*Response: Cross-Motion to Compel*").

6

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Pursuant to her obligations under the *Stipulated Protective Order* and *Order Regarding Sealing Requirements*, Plaintiff seeks an order permitting her to file the following documents
under seal, which were produced by Defendants Frankie Valli, Robert J. Gaudio, Marshall
Brickman, Eric S. Elice, DSHT, Inc., Dodger Theatricals, Inc., and/or JB Viva Vegas, LP (the
"New Defendants"), and/or by third party BASE Las Vegas Jersey Boys, and marked
"CONFIDENTIAL" and "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL" thereby, which she intends to attach as
exhibits to her *Response: Cross-Motion to Compel*:

- JB-0025278 through JB-0025282 consisting of financial information produced by
   New Defendants.
- BASE 00001 through BASE 00030 consisting of the letter agreement between
   BASE Las Vegas Jersey Boys (BASE Entertainment) and Jersey Boys Broadway
   LP.

Plaintiff further seeks an order permitting her to file the following court documents under
seal which support her *Response: Cross-Motion to Compel* but contain, in part, information
marked "Highly Confidential" by third party BASE Entertainment:

- Selected text on page 5 of *Plaintiff's Response to Jersey Boys Records Limited Partnership's Motion for Summary Judgment and Plaintiff's Cross-Motion to Compel Responses to Jurisdictional Discovery* which restates information
   contained in the letter agreement between BASE Entertainment and Jersey Boys
   Broadway LP.
- Selected text in Paragraph 11 of Rule 56(D) Declaration of John L. Krieger in
   Support of Plaintiff's Response to Defendant Jersey Boys Records Limited

Partnership's Motion for Summary Judgment and Plaintiff's Cross-Motion to Compel Jurisdictional Discovery which restates information contained in the letter agreement between BASE Entertainment and Jersey Boys Broadway LP.

## 4 I. <u>ARGUMENT</u>

1

2

3

5 There is an exception to the normal presumption of access to judicial records, for "sealed 6 discovery document[s] [attached] to a non-dispositive motion," such that "the usual presumption 7 of the public's right of access is rebutted." Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 8 1172, 1179-1180 (9th Cir. 2006) (citing Phillips v. General Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1213 9 (9th Cir. 2002)). The public has less of a need for access to court records attached only to nondispositive motions because those documents are often "unrelated, or only tangentially related, 10 to the underlying cause of action." Id. (quoting Seattle Times Co. v. Rhinehart, 467 U.S. 20, 33, 11 104 S. Ct. 2199, 81 L. Ed. 2d 17 (1984)). Moreover, "public policies that support the right of 12 13 access to dispositive motions, and related materials, do not apply with equal force to non-14 dispositive materials." Id. (citing Phillips, 307 F.3d at 1213). Finally, when a district court 15 grants a protective order to seal documents during discovery, "it already has determined that 16 'good cause' exists to protect this information from being disclosed to the public by balancing the needs for discovery against the need for confidentiality." Id. Accordingly, "good cause" 17 18 exists for the filing of the foregoing documents under seal.

19 Pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order herein, Plaintiff has an obligation to maintain 20 confidentiality marked "CONFIDENTIAL" "HIGHLY the of any document or 21 CONFIDENTIAL" by an opposing party, and the documents identified above were so marked by 22 the New Defendants and by BASE Las Vegas Jersey Boys. Accordingly, Plaintiff may not file 23 the documents with the Court without obtaining an Order and/or filing them under seal. Whereas, Plaintiff's Response: Cross-Motion to Compel is not a dispositive motion, the filing of 24 25 these documents under seal falls within the exception to the general presumption of public access 26 carved out by the courts of this Circuit for documents attached to non-dispositive motions. 27 Accordingly, leave to file the subject documents under seal should be granted.

28 ///

3

## 1 II. <u>CONCLUSION</u>

IN VIEW OF THE ABOVE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that her present motion be granted. Dated: October 11, 2011 **RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:** /s/ John L. Krieger Gregory H. Guillot George L. Paul John L. Krieger Robert H. McKirgan Attorneys for Plaintiff, Donna Corbello IT IS SO ORDERED: ROBERT C. JØNES Dated: This 27/ h day of October, 2011. 

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), I certify that on October 11, 2011, I electronically filed
3	the foregoing motion and this certificate of service with the clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF
4	system which will send notification of such filing to the following:
5	Daniel M. Mayeda, Esq.
6	Leopold, Petrich & Smith, P.C. 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3110
7	Los Angeles, CA 90067-3274
8	David S. Korzenik, Esq.
9	Miller Korzenik Sommers LLP 488 Madison Avenue, Suite 1120
10	New York, NY 10022-5702
11	Samuel S. Lionel, Esq. Todd Kennedy, Esq.
12	Lionel Sawyer & Collins
13	300 S. 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1700 Las Vegas, NV 89101
14	
15	Attorneys for the Non-DeVito Defendants
	L. Bradley Hancock, Esq. Christopher B. Payne, Esq.
16	Greenberg Traurig LLP
17	1000 Louisiana, Suite 1700
18	Houston, TX 77002
19	Booker T. Evans, Jr., Esq.
20	Greenberg Traurig LLP 2375 East Camelback Road, Suite 700
21	Phoenix, AZ 85016
22	Eric W. Swanis, Esq.
23	Greenberg Traurig, LLP 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 500 North
23	Las Vegas, NV 89169
24	Attorneys for Defendant Thomas Gaetano DeVito
23 26	
20 27	Debbie Robbins
28	