

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Dennis Pelczynski, David Black, )  
Michael Anderson, Rhodes Coman, )  
Marc Nichols, Daniel Schmidt, and )  
John Vinson, )

Civil Action No.: 4:11-cv-01829-RBH

Plaintiffs, )

**ORDER**

v. )

Orange Lake Country Club, Inc., and )  
OLCC South Carolina, LLC, )

Defendants. )

This matter comes before the Court on the motion of Defendants Orange Lake Country Club, Inc. and OLCC South Carolina, LLC to file certain attachments to their response to Plaintiffs' motion for attorney's fees under seal. ECF No. 113. The Court has reviewed the filings and attachments submitted on this matter. In accordance with *In re Knight Publishing Company*, 743 F.2d 231 (4th Cir. 1984), the Court grants the motion to seal on a temporary basis. Because *In re Knight* requires the Court to provide public notice of a party's request to seal and allow interested parties an opportunity to object, this order temporarily grants the motion to seal until October 28, 2013. If in the interim period any interested party wishes to object to the permanent sealing of the documents at issue, that party may file a notice of appearance and state its objections. In the event any objections are filed, the Court will schedule a hearing on the motion to seal and hear the arguments of all parties. Should no objections be filed by October 28, 2013, the temporary order will automatically convert to a permanent order to seal.

The Court considered less drastic alternatives to sealing the requested documents. The Court found that less drastic alternatives were not appropriate in this case, as the documents concern

Plaintiffs fee agreements with their counsel. The Court has independently reviewed the documents in camera and concludes that the documents do not lend themselves to selective redaction.

The Court finds persuasive the arguments of counsel in favor of sealing the documents and rejecting the alternatives. The documents contain confidential information regarding Plaintiffs' legal representation in this matter. The Court notes that the litigants' interest in nondisclosure of such proprietary information outweighs the public's right to access to these documents. See *May v. Medtronic Inc.*, No. CA 6:05-794-HMH, 2006 WL 1328765, \*1 (D.S.C. May 15, 2006). The confidential and sensitive nature of the information in the documents at issue requires that the documents be sealed. Therefore, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants' motion to seal (ECF No. 113) in accordance with the limitations stated herein.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina  
October 21, 2013