

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

* * *

CUNG LE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ZUFFA, LLC, d/b/a UFC Ultimate Fighting
Championship,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL¹

ORDER

(Mots. to Seal – ECF Nos. 434, 439)

This matter is before the court on the parties’ Motions to Seal (ECF Nos. 434, 439). These Motions are referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and LR IB 1-3 and 1-7 of the Local Rules of Practice.

The Motions seek leave to file under seal certain documents and exhibits referenced in the filings related to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Issuance of Letters Rogatory (ECF No. 433). *See* Sealed Exhibits (ECF No. 435) (attaching Pls.’ Unredacted Mot. (ECF No. 435-1); Exhibit 2 (ECF No. 435-2), Exhibit 7 (ECF No. 435-3), and Exhibit 8 (ECF No. 435-4)). Plaintiffs seek leave to file the documents under seal based on their obligation pursuant to the Amended Protective Order (ECF No. 2017) entered in this case governing confidentiality. Plaintiffs’ motion expresses no opinion regarding the confidentiality of the documents. Defendant Zuffa, LLC’s motion provides a particularized showing why the unredacted motion for issuance of letters rogatory along Exhibits 7 and 8 should remain under seal. Zuffa took no position on whether Exhibit 2, the Declaration of Matt Hume, a Vice-President of Operations for Group One Holdings, may be properly filed under seal.

¹ Member Case Nos.: 2:15-cv-01046-RCJ-NJK; 2:15-cv-01055-APG-GWF; 2:15-cv-01056-RFB-GWF; and 2:15-cv-01057-JCM-CWH.

1 Having reviewed and considered the matter in accordance with the Ninth Circuit's
2 directives set forth in *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006),
3 and its progeny, the court finds that the parties have met their burden of establishing good cause
4 for all but one of the documents to remain sealed. The parties narrowly tailored their sealing
5 requests to the extent possible by filing redacted versions of two of the documents containing
6 confidential information. *See* Pls.' Redacted Mot. (ECF No. 433); Redacted Exhibit 8 (ECF
7 No. 439-2). However, no party or non-party offered a declaration in support of sealing Mr.
8 Hume's declaration and a blanket protective order is not sufficient to permit the filing of
9 documents under seal.

10 Accordingly,

11 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 12 1. The parties' Motions to Seal (ECF Nos. 434, 439) are **GRANTED IN PART AND**
13 **DENIED IN PART.**
- 14 2. Plaintiffs' Unredacted Motion (ECF No. 435-1); Exhibit 7 (ECF No. 435-3), and
15 Exhibit 8 (ECF No. 435-4) shall remain under seal.
- 16 3. The Clerk of the Court shall **UNSEAL** Exhibit 2 (ECF No. 435-2).

17 Dated this 9th day of August, 2017.

18
19 
20 PEGGY A. KEEN
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE