

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

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-

