

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**

TRADE SHOW SERVICES, LTD,  
Plaintiff(s),  
vs.  
INTEGRATED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT  
SERVICES, INC., et al.,  
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:17-cv-01685-JAD-NJK  
ORDER  
(Docket No. 45)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to seal. Docket No. 45. Plaintiff submits that certain portions of the exhibits submitted in support of its motion to disqualify Defendant’s counsel should be sealed or, in the alternative, redacted. *Id.*; *see also* Docket Nos. 42, 43, 44 (motion to disqualify and accompanying exhibits). Plaintiff’s exhibits to its motion to disqualify include: the names of trusts established by Plaintiff’s owner (Leslie Bruno), the trusts’ beneficiaries, trustees, and successor trustees, the trustees’ compensation, the trusts’ distribution, Ms. Bruno’s social security number, home address, cell phone number, and home telephone number, the name of Ms. Bruno’s adult son, the addresses for Ms. Bruno’s investment properties, Ms. Bruno’s health directives and her health care agent’s contact information, membership information for one of Ms. Bruno’s corporate entities, and information regarding the scope of legal services provided by Defendant’s counsel to Ms. Bruno and details regarding Ms. Bruno’s various estate planning vehicles. Docket No. 45 at 7-24 (internal citations omitted).

1 Parties “who seek to maintain the secrecy of documents attached to dispositive motions must  
2 meet the high threshold of showing that ‘compelling reasons’ support secrecy.” *Kamakana v. City &*  
3 *County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006). Those compelling reasons must outweigh  
4 the competing interests of the public in having access to the judicial records and understanding the  
5 judicial process. *Id.* at 1178-79. In this case, the Court finds that compelling reasons exist to support  
6 some of the requested redactions. Accordingly, the motion to seal is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED**  
7 in part. Docket No. 45.

8 Exhibits 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 29 may remain as redacted. *See*  
9 *generally* Docket Nos. 29, 30. Exhibits 24 and 25 shall be maintained under seal. Docket No. 44 at 80-  
10 90.

11 As to Ms. Bruno’s home address in exhibit 1, it appears that the redacted version is worded  
12 differently than the un-redacted version and may refer to the actual address. Docket No. 29 at 7.  
13 However, the un-redacted version does not contain Ms. Bruno’s home address, only the county in which  
14 her home is located. Docket No. 43 at 7. In addition to the standard established by Local Rule IC 6-  
15 1(a)(5), the Court does not find compelling reasons to support redaction of Ms. Bruno’s home county.

16 As to exhibit 14, Plaintiff may redact the name of the owner of Pro-Tect Security Services, LLC,  
17 but may not maintain the entirety of the exhibit under seal. Docket No. 30 at 40. As to exhibit 15,  
18 Plaintiff may redact the name(s) of Pro-Tect Security Services, LLC’s officer(s) and manager(s) but may  
19 not maintain the entirety of the exhibit under seal. *Id.* at 42, 43, 45-49. As to exhibit 18, Plaintiff may  
20 redact the actual health care directive provided in the first paragraph but may not maintain the entirety  
21 of the exhibit under seal. *Id.* at 61.

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28

