

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

**Danielle S. Brissett, et al. v. Enterprise Leasing Company-West LLC,
et al.**

Brissett · No. 2:24-cv-01382-BNW · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada granted Plaintiffs’ motion to seal exhibits related to petitions for approval of settlements involving three minors. The court found compelling reasons to seal the exhibits because they contained personal identifying information and confidential settlement-related information, and it deemed the motion to shorten time moot.

OPINION

1 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 4 * * * 5 Danielle S. Brissett, et al., Case No. 2:24-cv-01382-BNW 6 Plaintiffs, ORDER 7 v. 8 Enterprise Leasing Company-West LLC, et al., 9 Defendants. 10 11 Before the Court is a motion to seal the exhibits attached to each of the three petitions for 12 minor compromise (ECF No. 30) and an accompanying motion to shorten time (ECF No. 31).

For 13 the reasons discussed below, the Court grants the motion to seal and finds the motion to shorten 14 time moot. 15 I. LEGAL STANDARD 16 Generally, the public has a right to inspect and copy judicial records. *Kamakana v. City & 17 Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). Such records are presumptively publicly 18 accessible. *Id.* Consequently, a party seeking to seal a judicial record bears the burden of 19 overcoming this strong presumption.

Id. In the case of dispositive motions, the party seeking to 20 seal the record must articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings that 21 outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure, such as the 22 public interest in understanding the judicial process. *Id.* at 1178–79 (alteration and internal 23 quotation marks and citations omitted).

The Ninth Circuit has further held that the full 24 presumption of public access applies to technically non-dispositive motions and attached 25 documents as well, as long as the motion is “more than tangentially related to the merits of the 26 case.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1101 (9th Cir. 2016). 27 Given the “weaker public interest in non-dispositive materials,” the court applies the good 1 are not more than tangentially related to the merits of the case.

Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass’n, 2 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010); Ctr. for Auto Safety, 809 F.3d at 1101. “Non-dispositive 3 motions ‘are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action,’ and, 4 as a result, the public’s interest in accessing dispositive materials does ‘not apply with equal 5 force’ to non-dispositive materials.” Pintos, 605 F.3d at 678 (citing Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 6 1179).

7 When reviewing proposed settlements of a minor’s claims, district courts must review any 8 compromise or settlement of a minor’s claims to ensure that the minor’s interests are protected. 9 See Robidoux v. Rosengren, 638 F.3d 1177, 1182 (9th Cir. 2011). “This inquiry is much closer to 10 a dispositive motion than the type of collateral discovery dispute for which records may be sealed 11 with just a showing of ‘good cause.’” Singleton v. Clark Cnty., No. 3:24-CV-05392-TMC, 2025 12 WL 2697140, at *2 (W.D.

Wash. Sept. 22, 2025). 13 II. ANALYSIS 14 Here, Plaintiffs move to seal four exhibits relating to the three minors’ petitions to 15 approve the settlement: (1) Settlement Agreement and Release of All Claims, Waiver of Rights, 16 and Agreement to Indemnify and Hold Harmless; (2) Emails Regarding Allocation of Net 17 Settlement Funds to Minors; (3) Breakdown of Settlement Proceeds; and (4) Breakdown of Case 18 Costs.

ECF No. 30 at 6. Plaintiffs argue that there is good cause to seal these exhibits because 19 they reference confidential information about Plaintiffs’ attorneys’ fees and costs and the 20 settlement amount, and disclosure of this information could violate Plaintiffs’ privacy rights. Id. 21 at 5. 22 As referenced above, the compelling reasons—not good cause—standard applies.

See 23 Singleton, 2025 WL 2697140, at *2. Nonetheless, the Court finds compelling reasons to seal the 24 exhibits given that they contain personal identifying information of Plaintiffs, which include the 25 minors. See A.G. by & through Gabot v. Albertson’s LLC, No. 2:24-CV-01943-CDS-MDC, 2025 26 WL 3004602, at *1 (D. Nev. Sept. 2, 2025) (finding compelling reasons to seal the petition to 27 approve a minor compromise because the petition included medical information and personal 1 || agreements exist would not meaningfully advance the public’s ability to understand the issue at 2 || hand.

See BBK Tobacco & Foods, LLP v. Aims Grp. USA Corp., No. 2:22-CV-01648-GMN- 3 || BNW, 2024 WL 4201896, at *1 (D. Nev. Sept. 13, 2024). I. CONCLUSION 5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ motion to seal (ECF No. 30) is 6 || GRANTED.

The Clerk’s Office is directed to maintain ECF No. 29 under seal. 7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants’ motion to shorten time (ECF No. 31) is 8 || MOOT. 9 10 DATED: January 9, 2026 1] Zi ow Les are En BR A WEKSLER 12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

