

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Imber v. Lackey

No. 1:22-cv-00004-HBK (E.D. Cal. June 16, 2025) · No. 1:22-cv-00004-HBK · Decided June 17, 2025

OPINION

Imber v. Lackey

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 BRANDON IMBER, individually and on Case No. 1:22-cv-00004-HBK behalf of all other
similarly situated,

12 ORDER GRANTING NOTICE OF REQUEST

Plaintiff, TO SEAL 13 v. (Doc. No. 157) 14

BRUCE LACKEY, PAM LACKEY,

15 LACKEY FAMILY TRUST, COLE

SCHARTON, THE ADMINISTRATIVE

16 COMMITTEE OF THE PEOPLE

BUSINESS EMPLOYEE STOCK

17 OWNERSHIP PLAN, MIGUEL

PAREDES, RICH ROUSH, DEL

18 THACKER, RICHARD DEYOUNG,

AND RITCHIE TRUCKING SERVICE

19 HOLDINGS, INC.,

20 Defendants. 21

On May 21, 2025, Plaintiff filed a request to seal an 18-page supplemental confidential 22
agreement as part of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. 23
(Doc. No. 157). Defendants did not submit an opposition under Local Rule 141(c). 24 The Court
has considered the factors set forth in *Oregonian Publishing Co. v. U.S.* 25 District Court for the
District of Oregon, 920 F.2d 1462 (9th Cir. 1990). The Court finds that, for 26 the reasons stated
in the Plaintiff’s request, sealing the supplemental confidential agreement 27 serves a compelling
interest. See, e.g., *Hefler v. Wells Fargo & Co.*, 2018 WL 4207245 (N.D. 28 1 | Cal. Sept. 4, 2018)
(collecting cases) (“There are compelling reasons to keep this information 2 | confidential in order
to prevent third parties from utilizing it for the improper purpose of 3 | obstructing the settlement
and obtaining higher payouts.”). The Court further finds that, in the 4 | absence of closure, the

compelling interests identified by Plaintiff would be harmed. In light of 5 | the public filing of its Notice to Seal, the Court further finds that there are no additional 6 | alternatives to sealing the supplemental confidential agreement that would adequately protect the 7 | compelling interests identified by the Plaintiff. 8 Accordingly, it is ORDERED: 9 1. Plaintiff's unopposed request to seal documents (Doc. No. 157) is GRANTED. 10 2. Within five (5) days of this Order, Plaintiff shall provide an electronic copy of the 11 | document to be sealed to the Clerk of Court by email to: ApprovedSealed @caed.uscourts.gov, at 12 | which time the Clerk of Court will file the documents under seal. See Local Rule 141(e)(2)q). 13 Dated: __June 16,2025 Wiha. ☐☐ fares Zackte

15 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA

6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28