

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH,
NORTHERN DIVISION

RVLock & Co, LLC v. MNDZ, LLC and Nicholas Menendez

RVLock · No. 1:25-cv-00182 · Decided April 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Utah grants in part and denies in part RVLock & Co., LLC’s motions to seal portions of its complaint and amended complaint, and denies the defendants’ motion to seal an employment contract. The court permits sealing of paragraphs 64 and 65, which concern product, supplier, and business-plan information, while directing that contract-related information and the separately sealed contract be unsealed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Utah, Northern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daphne A. Oberg, United States Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Utah, Northern Division
DECIDED	April 27, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00182
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	In a trade-secret misappropriation action, the plaintiff moved to seal portions of its complaint and first amended complaint, and the defendants moved to seal an employment contract attached to their opposition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the common-law presumption of public access to judicial records and required the party seeking restriction of access to show a significant countervailing interest that heavily outweighs the public interest in access.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum decision and order from a federal district court with no reporter citation.

TOPICS

- trade secrets
- misappropriation of trade secrets
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether portions of the complaint and first amended complaint discussing a confidential employment contract should remain sealed.
2. Whether paragraphs 64 and 65 of the complaint and first amended complaint, concerning RVLock's product, supplier, and business plans, should be sealed.
3. Whether the employment contract attached to the defendants' opposition should be filed under seal.

HOLDINGS

1. The court denied RVLock's motions to seal the portions of the complaint and first amended complaint discussing the employment contract and denied the defendants' motion to seal the contract because RVLock abandoned its request to protect that information and confidentiality alone was insufficient.
2. The court granted RVLock's motions to seal paragraphs 64 and 65 because those limited portions appeared to disclose proprietary information concerning RVLock's product, supplier, and business plans, and RVLock demonstrated an interest sufficient to justify sealing them.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Courts have long recognized a common-law right of access to judicial records."

"The burden is on the party seeking to restrict access to show some significant interest that outweighs the presumption."

"documents containing sensitive, proprietary information concerning a party's business practices may properly be sealed"

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

RVLock alleged that paragraphs 15 through 23 of its pleadings discussed a confidential employment contract and that paragraphs 64 and 65 discussed a supplier, a product, and business plans. After the defendants argued that the employment contract was a standard document without sensitive information, RVLock abandoned its request to seal the contract-related information. RVLock maintained that disclosure of the supplier and business-plan information would affect its competitiveness.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

RVLock moved for leave to file its complaint and first amended complaint under seal. The defendants opposed and separately moved to seal the employment contract attached to their opposition. RVLock abandoned its request to seal contract-related information but continued to seek sealing of allegations concerning a supplier, product, and business plans. The court granted RVLock's motions in part and denied them in part, denied the defendants' motion, ordered limited redactions, and directed that docket entry 28 be unsealed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Colony Ins. Co. v. Burke, 698 F.3d 1222, 1241 (10th Cir. 2012)
- Mann v. Boatright, 477 F.3d 1140, 1149 (10th Cir. 2007)
- Deherrera v. Decker Truck Line, Inc., 820 F.3d 1147, 1162 n.8 (10th Cir. 2016)
- Braun v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc., 719 F. App'x 782, 801 n.8 (10th Cir. 2017) (unpublished)
- Sacchi v. IHC Health Servs., Inc., 918 F.3d 1155, 1160 (10th Cir. 2019)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-utah-northe/2026/rvlock-and-co-llc-v-mndz-llc-and-nicholas-menendez-jqi0bodl>