

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**

UNIVERSAL ENTERTAINMENT  
CORPORATION,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

ARUZE GAMING AMERICA, INC., et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00585-RFB-NJK

**ORDER**

On August 14, 2018, the Court granted the parties' stipulated protective order. Docket No. 38. Pending before the Court is a motion for leave to file under seal the motion to modify the protective order in this case. Docket Nos. 128, 129. This order reminds counsel that there is a presumption of public access to judicial files and records. A party seeking to file a confidential document under seal must file a motion to seal and must comply with the Ninth Circuit's directives in *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006).

The Court has adopted electronic filing procedures. Attorneys must file documents under seal using the Court's electronic filing procedures. *See* Local Rule IA 10-5. Papers filed with the Court under seal must be accompanied with a concurrently-filed motion for leave to file those documents under seal. *See* Local Rule IA 10-5(a).

The Court approved the blanket protective order to facilitate discovery exchanges. But **there has been no showing, and the Court has not found, that any specific documents are**

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

15 If the sole ground for a motion to seal is that the opposing party (or non-party) has  
16 designated a document as confidential, the designator shall file (within seven days of the filing of  
17 the motion to seal) either (1) a declaration establishing sufficient justification for sealing each  
18 document at issue or (2) a notice of withdrawal of the designation(s) and consent to unsealing. If  
19 neither filing is made, the Court may order the document(s) unsealed without further notice.

20 **IT IS ORDERED** that counsel shall comply with the requirements of Local Rule IA 10-  
21 5, the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d 1172, and the procedures outlined above,  
22 with respect to any documents filed under seal. **To the extent any aspect of the stipulated protective**  
23 **order may conflict with this order or Local Rule IA 10-5, that aspect of the stipulated protective**  
24 **order is hereby superseded with this order.**

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: December 16, 2019

27  
28   
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge