

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, ORLANDO DIVISION

Megan Garcia and Sewell Setzer Jr., Individually and as the Personal
Representatives of the Estate of S.R.S. III v. Character Technologies,
Inc.; Noam Shazeer; Daniel De Frietas Adiwarsana; and Google LLC

Garcia · No. 6:24-cv-1903-ACC-DCI · Decided December 15, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida addresses Defendant Noam Shazeer’s motion to seal exhibits filed in support of his motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. The Court permits sealing of unredacted versions of three exhibits and public filing of redacted versions containing specified personal and financial information. It denies the request for permanent or indefinite sealing and sets the duration under Local Rule 1.11(e).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
DECIDED	December 15, 2025
DOCKET	6:24-cv-1903-ACC-DCI
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered Defendant Noam Shazeer's motion to seal unredacted exhibits submitted in support of his reply concerning his motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court assessed compliance with Middle District of Florida Local Rule 1.11(b) and determined whether the movant demonstrated good cause sufficient to overcome the presumptive common-law right of access to judicial records.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Megan Garcia, Sewell Setzer Jr., individually and as the personal representatives of the Estate of S.R.S. III v. Character Technologies, Inc., Noam Shazeer, Daniel De Frietas Adiwarsana, Google LLC

TOPICS

civil procedure

commercial litigation

motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Shazeer established good cause to seal the unredacted versions of Docs. 203-2, 203-3, and 203-4 and permit specified redactions on the public docket.
2. Whether the court could permanently or indefinitely seal the unredacted exhibits notwithstanding Local Rule 1.11(e)'s seal-duration provision.
3. Whether Doc. 203-5 should remain provisionally sealed or instead be replaced with the document submitted as Doc. 224-4.

HOLDINGS

1. Shazeer demonstrated good cause to file under seal the unredacted versions of Docs. 203-2, 203-3, and 203-4 and to file public versions redacting his social security number, home address, specified stock-purchase prices, and specified stock-grant amounts.
2. The court denied Shazeer's request to seal the unredacted exhibits permanently or indefinitely because Local Rule 1.11(e) provides that a seal expires ninety days after the case is closed and all appeals are exhausted, and Shazeer cited no authority supporting a different duration.
3. The court declined to consider a provisional sealing request based on De Freitas's unfiled memorandum and considered only Shazeer's request to seal the unredacted document and place a redacted version on the public docket; the clerk was directed to replace the placeholder at Doc. 203-5 with Doc. 224-4.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The filing of items under seal is governed by Local Rule 1.11(b)” (at 2)

“presumptive common law right to inspect and copy judicial records.” (at 2)

“A seal under Local Rule 1.11 “expires ninety days after a case is closed and all appeals are exhausted.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Shazeer submitted exhibits containing allegedly confidential information in support of his reply concerning personal jurisdiction. The requested redactions covered Shazeer's social security number, home address, compensation-related information, stock-purchase prices, and amounts of stock granted to Shazeer and certain early employees of Character AI. Shazeer sought to keep the unredacted exhibits sealed permanently or indefinitely, but cited no legal authority supporting that duration.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Shazeer moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and submitted redacted exhibits or placeholders with his reply. He then moved to seal the unredacted versions of three exhibits, seeking permanent or indefinite sealing. No party or nonparty opposed the motion within the permitted time. The court granted the motion in part, authorizing sealing subject to the local rule's duration limit and permitting specified redactions on the public docket, while denying permanent or indefinite sealing and addressing the placeholder for a fourth exhibit.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- U.S. v. Rosenthal, 763 F.2d 1291, 1292-93 (11th Cir. 1985)
- Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc., 435 U.S. 589, 597 (1978)
- Chicago Tribune Co. v. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc., 263 F.3d 1304, 1311 (11th Cir. 2001)
- Wilson v. American Motors Corp., 759 F.2d 1568, 1571 (11th Cir. 1985) (per curiam)
- Romero v. Drummond Co., 480 F.3d 1234, 1245 (11th Cir. 2007)
- Travelers Cos. v. Carrillo, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 202718, at *5-6 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 3, 2014)
- Wyndham Vacation Ownership, Inc. v. Slattery, Sobel & Decamp, LLP, 2020 WL 13862027, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 16, 2020)
- Merone v. Select Portfolio S Servicing, Inc., 2015 WL 12859326, at *1 (M.D. Fla. May 1, 2015)

OPINION

Garcia

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

ORLANDO DIVISION

MEGAN GARCIA and SEWELL

SETZER JR.,

individually and as the Personal Representatives of the Estate of S.R.S. III, Plaintiffs, v. Case No: 6:24-cv-1903-ACC-DCI CHARACTER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;

NOAM SHAZEER; DANIEL DE

FRIETAS ADIWARSANA; and

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendants. /

ORDER

On August 19, 2025, Defendant Noam Shazeer (Shazeer) filed a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Doc. 182. Plaintiffs responded, and Shazeer filed a Reply with leave of Court. Docs. 192, 203. In support of the Reply, Shazeer submitted certain redacted exhibits or

placeholders. Pending before the Court is Shazeer's Motion to Seal. Doc. 224 (the Motion). Shazeer contends that specific portions of the documents at issue should be sealed "permanently" or "indefinitely." *Id.* at 2, 6. No party or non-party has filed a memorandum in support of or in opposition to the seal, and the time for doing so has elapsed. For the reasons stated herein, the Motion is due to be granted in part. I. Standard The filing of items under seal is governed by Local Rule 1.11(b), which provides: (b) Motion to Seal. A motion to seal an item:

(1) must include in the title "Motion to Seal Under [Statute, Rule, or Order]"

or, if no statute, rule, or order applies, "Motion to Seal";

(2) must describe the item;

(3) must establish:

(A) that filing the item is necessary, (B) that sealing the item is necessary, and (C) that using a redaction, a pseudonym, or a means other than sealing is unavailable or unsatisfactory;

(4) must include a legal memorandum;

(5) must propose a duration for the seal;

(6) must state the name, mailing address, email address, and telephone number of the person authorized to retrieve a sealed, tangible item;

(7) must certify the name, mailing address, email address, and telephone

number of any non-party the movant knows or reasonably should know has an interest in establishing or maintaining the seal and the day on which, and the means by which, the movant served or otherwise delivered the motion to the non-party; and

(8) must include the item, which is sealed pending an order resolving the

motion. Local Rule 1.11(b). Once the Court has assessed compliance with the Local Rule, the Court then must determine whether the movant has shown good cause for sealing the documents. In deciding whether to grant a motion to seal, the Court must remain cognizant of a "presumptive common law right to inspect and copy judicial records." *U.S. v. Rosenthal*, 763 F.2d 1291, 1292-93 (11th Cir. 1985) (citing *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597 (1978)). This common law right "is instrumental in securing the integrity of the [judicial] process." *Chicago Tribune Co. v. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.*, 263 F.3d 1304, 1311 (11th Cir. 2001) (citations omitted); *Wilson v. Am. Motors Corp.*, 759 F.2d 1568, 1571 (11th Cir. 1985) (per curiam) ("The district court must keep in mind the rights of a third party—the public, 'if the public is to appreciate fully the often significant events at issue in public litigation and the workings of the legal system.'" (citation omitted)). Although the common law right of access creates a presumption against sealing court records, a party may overcome that presumption with a showing of good cause. *Romero v. Drummond Co.*, 480 F.3d 1234, 1245 (11th Cir. 2007). II. Discussion Shazeer claims that there are three documents attached to the Reply that contain confidential information. Doc. 224 (citing Docs. 203-2, 203-3, and 203-4). Shazeer states that he and Character Technologies designated information contained in these documents as confidential under the parties' "interim confidentiality agreement." *Id.* at 2. Shazeer adds that the Court has already

approved the request to seal Shazeer's confidential personal and financial information in documents Plaintiffs cited in their response and amended response to the motion to dismiss. *Id.* Shazeer represents that the proposed redactions are limited to his "confidential compensation-related information and personally-identifying information ('PII')." *Id.* at 4. Shazeer apparently argues that filing these exhibits is necessary to address the issue of personal jurisdiction. *Id.* at 5. Shazeer claims that "[i]n opposing Mr. Shazeer's motion to dismiss, Plaintiffs ignored entirely substantial evidence in the discovery record supporting Mr. Shazeer's declaration explaining that, at all relevant times, C.AI observed required corporate formalities." *Id.* at 5 to 6. Shazeer requests that the Court grant the Motion and "seal the unredacted versions of the documents indefinitely[.]" *Id.* at 6. Upon due consideration, the Court finds that there is good cause to permit Shazeer to file under seal the unredacted versions of Docs. 203-2 to 203-4 and to file on the public docket these exhibits with redactions to certain information. Specifically, Shazeer may redact from public view the portions of these exhibits that reflect Shazeer's social security number; home address; the purchase price for Shazeer's initial purchase of C.AI stock and amount of shares granted; the purchase price for Shazeer's initial purchase of Character Technologies, Inc. stock and amount of shares granted; and the purchase price for C.AI's early employees' purchase of C.AI stock and amount of shares granted. Doc. 224 at 5. See *Travelers Cos. v. Carrillo*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 202718, at *5 to 6 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 3, 2014) (denying the plaintiff's request to seal an offer letter because other offer letters were already disclosed to the public but permitting the plaintiff to file the document with "redactions to the salary, benefits, incentives, and other personal, sensitive information" that is not pertinent to the plaintiff's opposition to the motion to dismiss); *Wyndham Vacation Ownership, Inc. v. Slattery, Sobel & Decamp, LLP*, 2020 WL 13862027, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 16, 2020) (finding good cause to seal motions because they included sensitive financial and employment information) (citations omitted); *Merone v. Select Portfolio S Servicing, Inc.*, 2015 WL 12859326, at *1 (M.D. Fla. May 1, 2015) (denying a request to permanently seal a letter because the only personal information was the plaintiff's credit score and monthly gross income but finding that the information was "easily redacted" and did not require a seal).¹ Shazeer, however, has not established a basis to "permanently" or "indefinitely" seal the unredacted exhibits. A seal under Local Rule 1.11 "expires ninety days after a case is closed and all appeals are exhausted. To prevent the content of a sealed item from appearing on the docket after the seal expires, a party or interested non-party must move for relief before the seal expires." Local Rule 1.11(e). Shazeer cites to no law in support of the request and, therefore, this part of the Motion is due to be denied. ¹ In addition to his request to seal certain portions of Doc. 203-3, Shazeer states that "the Court should provisionally seal" the exhibit until Defendant De Freitas has an opportunity to file a memorandum in support of a seal. Doc. 224 at 5. Shazeer states that "De Freitas has an interest in the confidentiality of the document." *Id.* De Freitas has not filed a memorandum in support of a seal within the time for doing so. So, the Court will only consider Shazeer's request to seal the unredacted version of the document and to place on the public docket

the redacted version. Finally, Shazeer submitted a placeholder for Doc. 203-5, but explains now that he is “withdrawing his arguments to seal ECF No. 203-5, but is nonetheless submitting it to the Court for the Court’s consideration of that document in support of his Renewed Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 203).” Doc. 224 at 2 n.2. Shazeer has, therefore, submitted the document that should be attached at Doc. 203-5. II. Conclusion Based on the foregoing, the Court ORDERS that:

1. the Motion (Doc. 224) is GRANTED in part to the extent that on or before December 19, 2025, Shazeer may file under seal unredacted versions of Docs. 203-2, 203-3, and 203-4, which shall remain under seal until the 90th day after the date this case is closed and all appeals are exhausted (see Local Rule 1.11(e));
2. on or before December 19, 2025, Shazeer may file on the public docket Doc. 203-2, 203-3, and 203-4 with redactions to Shazeer’s social security number; home address; the purchase price for Shazeer’s initial purchase of C.AI stock and amount of shares granted; the purchase price for Shazeer’s initial purchase of Character Technologies, Inc. stock and amount of shares granted; and the purchase price for C.AI’s early employees’ purchase of C.AI stock and amount of shares granted;
3. the Clerk is directed to replace the placeholder at Doc. 203-5 with Doc. 224-4; and
4. the remainder of the Motion (Doc. 224) is DENIED.

ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on December 15, 2025. ae —

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE