1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
10		
11	DOTECH FINANCIAL LLC, et al., Plaintiff(s),	Case No.: 2:17-cv-02029-RFB-NJK
12		Order
13		
14	ANTELOPE HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION, et al.,	
15	Defendant(s).	
16	Pending before the Court is a Stipulated Protective Order, which the Court approved to	
17	7 facilitate discovery in this case. This order reminds counsel that there is a presumption of public	
18	access to judicial files and records. A party seeking to file a confidential document under seal	
19	must file a motion to seal and must comply with the Ninth Circuit's directives in Kamakana v. City	
20	and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006).	
21	The Court has adopted electronic filing procedures. Attorneys must file documents under	
22	2 seal using the Court's electronic filing procedures. See Local Rule IA 10-5. Papers filed with the	
23	Court under seal must be accompanied with a concurrently-filed motion for leave to file those	
24	documents under seal. See Local Rule IA 10-5(a).	
25	The Court has approved the blanket protective order to facilitate discovery exchanges. But	
26	there has been no showing, and the Court has not found, that any specific documents are	
27	secret or confidential. The parties have not provided specific facts supported by declarations or	
28	concrete examples to establish that a protective order is required to protect any specific trade secret	
	1	

or other confidential information pursuant to Rule 26(c) or that disclosure would cause an 1 2 identifiable and significant harm. The Ninth Circuit has held that there is a presumption of public access to judicial files and records, and that parties seeking to maintain the confidentiality of 3 documents attached to nondispositive motions must show good cause exists to overcome the 4 presumption of public access. See Kamakana 447 F.3d at 1179. Parties seeking to maintain the 5 secrecy of documents attached to dispositive motions must show compelling reasons sufficient to 6 7 overcome the presumption of public access. Id. at 1180. All motions to seal must address the 8 applicable standard and explain why that standard has been met. The fact that a court has 9 entered a blanket stipulated protective order and that a party has designated a document as 10 confidential pursuant to that protective order does not, standing alone, establish sufficient grounds 11 to seal a filed document. See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th 12 Cir. 2003); see also Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co., 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992).

If the sole ground for a motion to seal is that the opposing party (or non-party) has 13 14 designated a document as subject to protection pursuant to the stipulated protective order, the 15 movant must notify the opposing party (or non-party) at least seven days prior to filing the designated document. The designating party must then make a good faith determination if the 16 17 pertinent standard for sealing is met. To the extent the designating party does not believe the pertinent standard for sealing can be met, it shall indicate that the document may be filed publicly 18 19 no later than four days after receiving notice of the intended filing. To the extent the designating party believes the pertinent standard for sealing can be met, it shall provide a declaration 20supporting that assertion no later than four days after receiving notice of the intended filing. The 21 22 filing party shall then attach that declaration to its motion to seal the designated material. If the designating party fails to provide such a declaration in support of the motion to seal, the filing 23 party shall file a motion to seal so indicating and the Court may order the document filed in the 24 public record.<sup>1</sup> 25

26

27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In the event of an emergency motion or other instances of expedited briefing, the above procedures shall not apply. Instead, the movant shall file a motion to seal and the designating party shall file a declaration in support of that motion to seal within three days of its filing. If the

1	IT IS ORDERED that counsel shall comply with the requirements of Local Rule IA 10-	
2	5, the Ninth Circuit's decision in Kamakana, 447 F.3d 1172, and the procedures outlined above,	
3	with respect to any documents filed under seal. To the extent any aspect of the stipulated protective	
4	order may conflict with this order or Local Rule IA 10-5, that aspect of the stipulated protective	
5	order is hereby superseded with this order.	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
7	Dated: November 6, 2018	
8	Nor on L Kong	
9	Nancy J. Koppe United States Magistrate Judge	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28	designating party fails to timely file such a declaration, the Court may order the document filed in the public record.	
	3	