

1 long as the motion is “more than tangentially related to the merits of the case.” *Ctr. for Auto*
2 *Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2016).

3 “Nondispositive motions ‘are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the
4 underlying cause of action,’ and, as a result, the public’s interest in accessing dispositive
5 materials does ‘not apply with equal force’ to nondispositive materials.” *Pintos*, 605 F.3d at 678
6 (citing *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179). Given the “weaker public interest in nondispositive
7 materials,” the court applies the good cause standard to evaluate whether to seal documents
8 attached to a nondispositive motion that are unrelated or only tangentially related to the merits of
9 the case. *Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass’n*, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010).

10 Good cause requires a particularized showing that specific harm or prejudice will result if
11 the information is disclosed. *Phillips ex rel. Ests. of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206,
12 121011 (9th Cir. 2002). “Broad allegations of harm, unsubstantiated by specific examples or
13 articulated reasoning,” do not satisfy the good cause requirement under Rule 26(c). *Beckman*
14 *Indus., Inc. v. Int’l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992) (quoting *Cipollone v. Liggett Grp.,*
15 *Inc.*, 785 F.2d 1108, 1121 (3d Cir. 1986)).

16 **II. Plaintiffs’ Motions to Seal (ECFs Nos. 154 and 158)**

17 Here, Plaintiffs seek to seal Exhibits 2 and 38. The exhibits were attached to two
18 nondispositive status reports and are unrelated to the merits of the case. Accordingly, the good
19 cause standard applies to whether these documents should be sealed. *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at
20 1180.

21 The two exhibits Plaintiffs seek to seal are lists of jewels and jewelry owned by Mr.
22 Abraham. Plaintiffs argue that this information should be sealed because Mr. Abraham could be
23 placed in danger if this information was publicly disclosed. Plaintiffs base their arguments on Mr.
24 Abraham’s representations that, because of the type of assets he owns, he “has been robbed three
25 times, the last time with a gun.” *See* Exhibit 14.

26 Good cause exists to seal these documents. Mr. Abraham’s has represented multiple times
27 throughout the course of this litigation that he has been robbed several times, including at
28 gunpoint. The Court is persuaded that publicly disclosing his assets could expose him to further

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

danger. There is also a diminished need for the public to access these documents because they are unrelated to the merits of the action. Accordingly, the Court will grant Plaintiffs' motions to seal.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion to seal ECF No. 154 is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion to seal ECF No. 158 is GRANTED.

DATED: June 30, 2021



BRENDA WEKSLER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE