

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

J.M.M., et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

ANDREA HERNANDEZ, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:14-cv-01197-JAD-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 32)

Pending before the Court is Defendant Lisa Brochu’s (“Defendant”) sealed motion to amend. Docket No. 32. The Court issued an order to show cause why that motion should not be unsealed. Docket No. 33. The Court has now received a response from Defendant. Docket No. 34. In essence, Defendant asserts that the motion was filed under seal to protect the anonymity of the minor Plaintiffs given that the attached proposed amended answer includes their full names. *Id.* at 2. The anonymity of minor children is protected by filing documents that only provide their initials, rather than their full names. *See* Docket No. 18 (order requiring the parties to fully comply with Special Order No. 108, which requires only a minor’s initials be provided on filed documents); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.2(a) (requiring that filings with the court may include only the minor’s initials, rather than full name). Accordingly, Defendant’s proposed pleading should not have included the minor Plaintiff’s names in the first place.


In light of the above, the Court **ORDERS** that the documents at Docket No. 32 shall remain under seal. The Court further **ORDERS** Defendant to file on the public docket, no later than May 27,

1 2015, an amended motion and exhibit that are identical in all respects to Docket No. 32 except that the
2 names of the minor Plaintiffs are replaced with only their initials. The briefing schedule on the motion
3 to amend shall continue to be set based on the May 11, 2015 filing of the motion.

4 Lastly, the Court further **ORDERS** Defendant’s counsel to familiarize themselves with Special
5 Order No. 108 and fully comply with it in the future. The Court expects strict compliance with the orders
6 and rules of the Court, and the parties and counsel should be aware that failure to comply may result in
7 sanctions. *See, e.g., Davis v. Clark County Sch. Dist.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. Lexis 128937, *5 n.3 (D. Nev.
8 Sept. 9, 2013) (sanctioning counsel for repeated failure to comply with Court orders, including order to
9 use only minor’s initials in filings).

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED: May 20, 2015



12 _____
13 NANCY J. KOPPE
14 United States Magistrate Judge