

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rodionova v. Qatar Airways Group (Q.C.S.C.)

Rodionova · No. 25-cv-05838-TSH · Decided July 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denied Plaintiff Iana Rodionova’s motion to seal her in forma pauperis application. The court held that the application contained no information requiring redaction and that the plaintiff had not shown that sealing was warranted under Civil Local Rule 79-5.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Thomas S. Hixson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	July 24, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-05838-TSH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, moved to seal her application to proceed in forma pauperis. The court construed the filing as a motion to seal the application under Civil Local Rule 79-5.1.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the standards governing sealing judicial records under Civil Local Rule 79-5, including the requirement of a specific showing of the interests supporting sealing, the injury from disclosure, and why a less restrictive alternative is insufficient.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure court records and sealing

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis should be sealed under Civil Local Rule 79-5.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to seal was denied because Plaintiff did not establish a basis for sealing the application, and the financial information in the application was not sufficiently private to warrant sealing or redaction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

- “The public has a right of access to the Court’s files.”* (at 1)
- “Litigants must “minimize the number of documents filed under seal” and “avoid wherever possible sealing entire documents (as opposed to merely redacting the truly sensitive information in a document).””* (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Iana Rodionova filed a motion to seal her application to proceed in forma pauperis. The application contained financial information, but the court found that none of it required redaction. The court noted that financial affidavits supporting in forma pauperis applications are generally filed publicly.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis and then moved to seal it. The district court denied the motion to seal, finding that the application contained no information requiring redaction and that financial affidavits supporting in forma pauperis applications are generally publicly filed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Cooney v. California, 2013 WL 1748053, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2013)
- Rodionova v. Qatar Airways Grp. (Q.C.S.C.), 2025 WL 1870775, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 16, 2025)
- Firsov v. Frontier Airlines, Inc., 2025 WL 1533138, at *2 (N.D. Cal. May 28, 2025)
- Firsov v. Skyscanner, Inc., 2025 WL 1900328, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2025)

OPINION

Rodionova v. Qatar Airways Group (Q.C.S.C.)

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO SEAL

9 v. Re: Dkt. No. 6

10 QATAR AIRWAYS GROUP (Q.C.S.C.), et

al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 Plaintiff Iana Rodionova has filed a “Motion to Seal Application IFP,” which, given her 14 pro se status, the Court construes as a request to seal her in forma pauperis application (ECF No. 15 3) pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5.1 ECF No. 6. 16 “The public has a right of access to the Court’s files.” Civ. L.R. 79-5(a). Litigants must 17 “minimize the number of documents filed under seal” and “avoid wherever possible sealing entire 18 documents (as opposed to merely redacting the truly sensitive information in a document).” Id. 19 The party requesting sealing must provide “a specific statement of the applicable legal standard 20 21 1 Plaintiff and her husband, Sergey Firsov, have filed at least 22 cases in this District over the last four months. See *Firsov v. Alaska Airlines*, 5:25-cv-02841; *Rodionova v. Qatar Airways Group* 22 (Q.C.S.C.), 5:25-cv-02871; *Firsov v. Frontier Airlines, Inc.*, 5:25-cv-02898; *Rodionova et al v. Western Union Financial Services, Inc.*, 3:25-cv-03054; *Firsov v. Skyscanner, Inc et al.*, 4:25-cv-23 03198; *Firsov, minor, by & through parent Sergey Firsov v. Church of Scientology of Silicon Valley et al.*, 5:25-cv-03265; *Firsov v. JetBlue Airways Corporation*, 3:25-cv-03387; *Firsov v. 24 Austrian Airlines AG*, 5:25-cv-03504; *Firsov v. Turkish Airlines, Inc.*, 3:25-cv-03689; *Firsov v. Scandinavian Airlines of North America, Inc.*, 4:25-cv-03691; *Firsov v. United Airlines, Inc et al.*, 25 5:25-cv-03784; *Firsov v. United Airlines, Inc. et al.*, 4:25-cv-03903; *Rodionova v. Turkish Airlines, Inc. et al.*, 3:25-cv-03912; *Firsov et al v. Air Canada, Inc.*, 3:25-cv-04058; *Firsov et al v. 26 Moneygram Payment Systems, Inc.*, 5:25-cv-04726; *Firsov et al v. Western Union Financial Services, Inc.*, 5:25-cv-04727; *Firsov et al v. Dandelion Payments, Inc.*, 5:25-cv-04765; *Firsov v. 27 JetBlue Airways Corporation*, 3:25-cv-05240; *Firsov et al v. Qatar Airways Group (Q.C.S.C.)*, 1 and the reasons for keeping a document under seal.” Civ. L.R. 79-5(c)(1). This must include an 2 || explanation of “(i) the legitimate private or public interests that warrant sealing; (11) the injury that 3 will result if sealing is denied; and (iii) why a less restrictive alternative to sealing is not 4 || sufficient.” Id. 5 Here, none of the information in Plaintiffs application requires redaction, and financial 6 affidavits in support of applications to proceed in forma pauperis generally are not filed under seal. 7 || See *Cooney v. California*, 2013 WL 1748053, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2013) (“Plaintiffs IFP 8 application contains information no more private than any of the other IFP applications that are 9 || regularly publicly filed with this Court.”); *Rodionova v. Qatar Airways Grp. (Q.C.S.C.)*, 2025 WL 10 1870775, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 16, 2025) (denying Rodionova’s motion to seal IFP application 11 that included the same financial information as in this case); *Firsov v. Frontier Airlines, Inc.*, 2025 12 || WL 1533138, at *2 (N.D. Cal. May 28, 2025) (denying Firsov’s motion to seal IFP application); 13 *Firsov v. Skyscanner, Inc.*, 2025 WL 1900328, at *2 (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2025) (same). 14 || Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion to seal is DENIED. 3 15 IT IS SO ORDERED. 17 Dated: July 24, 2025 18 LAA. Lj —

THOMAS S. HIXSON

19 United States Magistrate Judge 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-fo/2025/rodionova-v-qatar-airways-group-q-c-s-c-exwf5ce7>