

1 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
2 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

3 \*\*\*

4  
5 LUZ ELENA CUADROS, on behalf of herself  
6 and all others similarly situated,

7 Plaintiff,

8 vs.

9 STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY  
10 COMPANY,

11 Defendant.

2:16-cv-02025-JCM-VCF

**ORDER**

MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL (ECF  
NOS. 99 AND 105).

12 Before the Court is Plaintiff Luz Elena Cuadros' ("Plaintiff") Motion for Leave to File her  
13 Renewed Motion to Compel Discovery and all accompanying exhibits Under Seal (ECF No. 99) and her  
14 motion to file her Reply Memorandum In Support of Renewed Motion to Compel Discovery under seal.  
15 (ECF No. 105). For the reasons stated below, the motions are granted.

16 Plaintiff filed a motion to compel discovery in an action against State Farm Fire and Casualty  
17 Company ("Defendant") on June 14, 2018. (ECF Nos. 100, 101). In support of this motion, Plaintiff  
18 attached exhibits classified as confidential under the protective order granted by the undersigned  
19 Magistrate Judge. (ECF No. 99). Additional confidential documents were attached to her reply. (ECF Nos.  
20 106, 107).

21 The Ninth Circuit has emphasized a strong presumption in favor of access to court records and  
22 documents. *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003). This general  
23 right to public documents, however, is not absolute. *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns*, 435 U.S. 589, 598  
24 (1978). The Court may allow a party to file a document under seal without redaction, pursuant to Fed. R.  
25

1 Civ. P. 5.2(d). Local Rule IA 10-5 explains that a party may file a document with the court under seal if  
2 accompanied by a motion for leave to file those documents under seal.

3 A party seeking to seal documents in support of a non-dispositive motion must only show “good  
4 cause” exists to seal the documents in question. *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d  
5 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). When a court grants a protective order to seal discovery documents, “it  
6 already has determined that ‘good cause’ exists to protect this information from being disclosed to the  
7 public by balancing the needs for discovery against the needs for ‘confidentiality’.” *Phillips v. GMC*, 307  
8 F.3d 1206, 1213 (9th Cir. 2002). Because the motion to compel is not dispositive, and the approved  
9 stipulated protective order designates the documents in question as confidential, the good cause standard  
10 is met and Plaintiff’s motion to seal is granted.


11  
12 ACCORDINGLY, and for good cause shown,

13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Plaintiff Luz Elena Cuadros’ Motion for Leave to File her Motion  
14 to Compel Discovery and all accompanying exhibits to her motion (ECF No. 99) is GRANTED.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File her Reply Memorandum In  
16 Support of Renewed Motion to Compel Discovery under seal (ECF No. 105) is GRANTED.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that ECF Nos. 100, 107 shall remain under seal.

18  
19 DATED this 12th day of July, 2018.

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 CAM FERENBACH  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25