

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

**M.B., V.C., and Matt B. v. Medtronic, Inc., Medtronic USA, Inc., and
Integra LifeSciences Corporation**

M.B. v. Medtronic · No. 2:26-cv-00332-HCN-JCB · Decided May 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Utah grants plaintiffs’ motion to proceed under pseudonyms in a products-liability action involving medical treatment and a minor’s medical history. The court also orders all prior filings sealed and directs the Clerk to update the docket to reflect the pseudonymous caption.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Utah
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jared C. Bennett
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Utah
DECIDED	May 27, 2026
DOCKET	2:26-cv-00332-HCN-JCB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved to proceed under pseudonyms and to redact or seal prior filings. The defendants did not oppose the motion. The magistrate judge granted the motion and ordered all prior filings sealed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Abuse-of-discretion framework applies to a court's decision whether to permit a plaintiff to proceed under a pseudonym; the court weighs exceptional circumstances against the public's interest in access to judicial proceedings.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum decision and order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	M.B., V.C., Matt B. v. Medtronic, Inc., Medtronic USA, Inc., Integra LifeSciences Corporation

TOPICS

civil procedure

pleadings

medical records privacy

hipaa

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

health law

privacy

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs should be permitted to proceed under pseudonyms based on exceptional circumstances, including the plaintiff's minority at the time of the underlying events and the sensitive medical information likely to appear in the record.
2. Whether previously filed documents containing plaintiffs' full names should be redacted or sealed.

HOLDINGS

1. A court may permit plaintiffs to proceed under pseudonyms when exceptional circumstances justify anonymity and the interest in protecting the plaintiffs' identities outweighs the public's interest in access to the proceedings. The circumstances here warranted anonymity for M.B. and M.B.'s parents.
2. When previously filed documents cannot be redacted, the court may seal those filings for good cause shown to protect plaintiffs' identities and sensitive medical information.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Exceptional circumstances include those cases “involving matters of a highly sensitive and personal nature, real danger of physical harm, or where the injury litigated against would be incurred as a result of the disclosure of the plaintiff’s identity.””

“In sum, the public interest in access to Plaintiffs’ identities appears relatively limited compared to the interest in protecting Plaintiffs’ identities and matters of a highly sensitive and personal nature.”

“Because the court is unable to redact previously filed documents, the court, for good cause shown, grants Plaintiffs’ alternative request to seal all prior filings.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

M.B. was born with spina bifida and was a minor when the events underlying the action occurred. At age sixteen, M.B. underwent spinal cord detethering surgery during which a device manufactured and distributed by defendants was used, and plaintiffs allege that M.B. suffered serious medical complications. The anticipated record includes extensive medical, surgical, treatment, and protected-health-information records concerning M.B. Plaintiffs sought anonymity for M.B. and M.B.'s parents because disclosure of the parents' identities could effectively reveal M.B.'s identity and medical information.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs originally filed the action in Utah Third District Court. Defendants removed it to the United States District Court for the District of Utah. After removal, plaintiffs sought permission to continue under pseudonyms and requested redaction or sealing of previously filed documents. The court granted permission to use pseudonyms and, because previously filed documents could not be redacted, ordered all prior filings sealed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Nat'l Commodity & Barter Ass'n, Nat'l Commodity Exch. v. Gibbs, 886 F.2d 1240, 1245 (10th Cir. 1989)
- Femedeer v. Haun, 227 F.3d 1244, 1246 (10th Cir. 2000)
- U.S. Dep't of Just. v. Utah Dep't of Com., No. 2:16-cv-00611-DN-DBP, 2017 WL 963203, at *1 (D. Utah Mar. 10, 2007)
- Lindsey v. Dayton-Hudson Corp., 592 F.2d 1118, 1125 (10th Cir. 1979)
- W.N.J. v. Yocom, 257 F.3d 1171, 1172 (10th Cir. 2001)
- N.E. v. Blue Cross Blue Shield of N.C., No. 1:21CV684, 2023 WL 2696834, at *15 (M.D.N.C. Feb. 24, 2023)
- Doe v. USD No. 237, No. 16-cv-2801-JWL-TJJ, 2017 WL 3839416, at *11 (D. Kan. Sept. 1, 2017)
- S.E.S. v. Galena Unified Sch. Dist. No. 499, No. 18-2042-DDC-GEB, 2018 WL 3389878, at *2 (D. Kan. July 12, 2018)