

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Natasha Hiller v. Money Source Incorporated

Hiller · No. CV-23-00235-PHX-JJT · Decided December 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona addresses the parties’ requests to seal materials related to their motions for partial summary judgment. The court grants the parties’ stipulation, grants in part and denies in part the defendant’s motion, orders certain documents sealed, and requires a redacted version of the defendant’s motion to be publicly filed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	December 8, 2025
DOCKET	CV-23-00235-PHX-JJT
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly stipulated to the sealing of portions of their motions for partial summary judgment and related exhibits. Defendant separately moved to file its motion and exhibits under seal, and the court ruled on both requests.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Natasha Hiller v. Money Source Incorporated

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the parties demonstrated sufficient grounds to seal portions of their motions for partial summary judgment and related exhibits.

2. Whether Defendant was required to file a redacted version of its motion and exhibits on the public docket rather than lodging that version under seal.
3. When Plaintiff's time to respond to Defendant's motion for partial summary judgment should begin.

HOLDINGS

1. Because the dispositive motions were more than tangentially related to the merits, the parties were required to show compelling reasons for sealing. Protecting private personal information and proprietary, non-public business information from public disclosure constituted a compelling reason to seal unredacted documents containing that information.
2. Defendant could not keep its redacted motion for partial summary judgment and exhibits under seal; the redacted version had to be filed publicly for the benefit of public access.
3. Plaintiff's time to respond to Defendant's motion for partial summary judgment would begin the day after Defendant filed a redacted version of the motion and exhibits on the public record.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"In the Ninth Circuit, courts "start with a strong presumption in favor of access to court records." (at 1)

"The Court finds that protecting private personal and business information from public disclosure is a compelling reason to seal the unredacted documents containing that information." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties sought to seal private personal information of class members, including telephone numbers, loan numbers, and street addresses, as well as Defendant's proprietary and non-public business information, in connection with dispositive motions. Plaintiff publicly filed a redacted version of her motion and exhibits, while Defendant lodged its redacted version under seal rather than filing it publicly.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties filed motions for partial summary judgment and related exhibits in this civil action. Plaintiff filed a redacted motion publicly and lodged unredacted materials under seal; Defendant lodged both redacted and unredacted materials under seal. The court granted the parties' stipulation, granted Defendant's motion in part and denied it in part, required Defendant to publicly file a redacted version, and deferred Plaintiff's response period until that filing.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)

- Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1103 (9th Cir. 2016)

OPINION

1 WO 2 3 4 5 6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 8 9 Natasha Hiller, No. CV-23-00235-PHX-JJT 10 Plaintiff, ORDER 11 v. 12 Money Source Incorporated, 13 Defendant. 14 15 At issue is Plaintiff Natasha Hiller and Defendant Money Source Incorporated's 16 joint Stipulation Pursuant to LRCiv. 5.6(d) Regarding Sealing of Court Records 17 ("Stipulation") (Doc.

79). Defendant additionally filed its Unopposed Motion to File Its 18 Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Under Seal (PPI Redactions) ("Defendant's 19 Motion") (Doc. 81). The parties request permission to file under seal certain documents 20 pertaining to their respective Motions for Partial Summary Judgment ("MPSJ") and 21 exhibits (see Docs. 77, 80, 82, 85).

As set forth below, the Court will grant the Stipulation 22 and grant in part and deny in part Defendant's Motion. 23 In the Ninth Circuit, courts "start with a strong presumption in favor of access to 24 court records." Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 25 2016) (quoting Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir.

26 2003)). "In order to overcome this strong presumption, a party seeking to seal a judicial 27 record must articulate justifications for sealing that outweigh the historical right of access 28 and the public policies favoring disclosure." Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu, 447 1 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006). Where a document is "more than tangentially related 2 to the merits" of a case, the party seeking to seal the document must demonstrate 3 "compelling reasons to keep the documents under seal." Ctr. for Auto Safety, 809 F.3d at 4 1103.

5 Undoubtedly, the parties' dispositive MPSJs are more than tangentially related to 6 the merits of this matter. Therefore, the parties must demonstrate compelling reasons to 7 justify keeping those documents under seal.

Here, the parties stipulate to redact class 8 members' private personal information, including telephone numbers, loan numbers, and 9 street addresses, and Defendant's proprietary and non-public business information. (Doc. 10 79 at 2.) Pursuant to the Stipulation, Plaintiff filed a redacted version of her MPSJ and 11 exhibits (Doc. 77) and lodged the unredacted portions under seal (Doc.

80). 12 In addition to the Stipulation, Defendant separately moves the Court for permission 13 to file its MPSJ and exhibits under seal to "redact the class members' private personal 14 information." (Doc. 81 at 1.) Pursuant to Defendant's Motion, Defendant lodged under seal 15 a redacted and unredacted version of its MPSJ and exhibits (Docs. 82, 85). 16 The Court finds that

protecting private personal and business information from 17 public disclosure is a compelling reason to seal the unredacted documents containing that 18 information.

Sealing the unredacted documents that contain such information, however, 19 does not alleviate the need for the parties to file redacted versions of those documents for 20 the benefit of the public. Plaintiff complied with this obligation (see Doc. 77). Defendant, 21 on the other hand, lodged the redacted version of its MPSJ and exhibits under seal (Doc. 22 82) rather than filing it on the public docket.

23 Accordingly, the Court will grant the Stipulation, grant in part and deny in part 24 Defendant's Motion, and direct the Clerk of Court to seal documents lodged at docket 25 entries 80 and 85. The Clerk of Court is directed not to seal the documents lodged at docket 26 entry 82. Pursuant to Local Rule 5.6(e), Defendant shall resubmit the document located at 27 docket entry 82 for public filing within five days from the date of this Order.

Because no 28 redacted version of Defendant's MPSJ and exhibits are available publicly and Defendant 1 || indicates that it transmitted only a notice of the filings to Plaintiff, the Court assumes that Plaintiff has not received a copy of Defendant's MPSJ.

Therefore, Plaintiff's time to 3 || respond to Defendant's MPSJ shall begin the day after Defendant files the redacted version of its MPSJ on the public record. 5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED granting the parties' Stipulation Pursuant to || LRCiv. 5.6(d) Regarding Sealing of Court Records (Doc. 79). 7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting in part and denying in part Defendant 8 || Money Source Incorporated's Unopposed Motion to File Its Motion for Partial Summary || Judgment Under Seal (PPI Redactions) (Doc.

81). 10 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED directing the Clerk of Court to file under seal the 11 || documents currently lodged under seal at docket entries 80 and 85. 12 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED directing the Clerk of Court not to file under seal 13 || the document currently lodged under seal at docket entry 82. 14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, within five (5) days of the entry of this Order, 15 || Defendant shall resubmit the document located at docket entry 82 for public filing.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's time to respond to Defendant's 17|| Motion for Partial Summary Judgment shall begin the day after Defendant files a redacted 18 || version of those documents on the public record. 19 Dated this 8th day of December, 2025. CN iy. 71 Unifgd StatesDistrict Judge 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 -3-