Korba v. Hartford Underwriters Insurance Company Doc. 26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ZAN KORBA, Plaintiff, vs. HARTFORD UNDERWRITERS INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendant.	)	Case No. 2:12-cv-01391-GMN-PAL **AMENDED ORDER**

Before the court is Defendant's Motion to File Non-Dispositive Motion Under Seal (Dkt. #24).

Hartford intends to file a motion to compel the Plaintiff to submit to a Rule 35 exam. Counsel asks for leave to file the motion under seal because it will refer to correspondence between Plaintiff's counsel and Hartford concerning the doctor who performed an examination during claims handling. Counsel for Hartford states that Plaintiff's counsel's repeated editorial opinions regarding the physician are inflammatory, personal, and could cause scandal regarding the physician's services if published in a public forum. The motion to compel will refer to the correspondence and attach the correspondence as exhibits. Under these circumstances, Hartford maintains there is good cause to file the motion and supporting exhibits under seal.

Having reviewed and considered the matter, the court will permit Hartford to file the motion to compel and supporting exhibits under seal. However, the court will also require Hartford to file a redacted version of the motion and supporting Exhibits 1(f), 1(h) and 1(j) on the public docket.

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

///

Dockets.Justia.com

IT IS ORDERED the Motion (Dkt. #24) is **GRANTED in part**. Hartford may file the motion and supporting exhibits under seal. However, Hartford shall file a redacted version of the motion and supporting exhibits on the docket in the public record.

Dated this 18th day of April, 2013.

Peggy A. Leen
United States Magistrate Judge