

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Imber v. Lackey

Imber · No. 1:22-cv-00004-HBK · Decided June 24, 2025

OPINION

Imber v. Lackey

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 BRANDON IMBER, individually and on Case No. 1:22-cv-00004-HBK behalf of all other
similarly situated,

12 ORDER GRANTING REQUEST TO SEAL

Plaintiff, 13 (Doc. No. 162) v. 14

BRUCE LACKEY, PAM LACKEY,

15 LACKEY FAMILY TRUST, COLE

SCHARTON, THE ADMINISTRATIVE

16 COMMITTEE OF THE PEOPLE

BUSINESS EMPLOYEE STOCK

17 OWNERSHIP PLAN, MIGUEL

PAREDES, RICH ROUSH, DEL

18 THACKER, RICHARD DEYOUNG,

AND RITCHIE TRUCKING SERVICE

19 HOLDINGS, INC.,

20 Defendants. 21

22 On June 16, 2025, Plaintiff filed a request to seal a 2023 Valuation Report and portions of 23
Plaintiff’s reply brief regarding his Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement
24 (Doc. No. 158). (Doc. No. 162). Defendants did not submit an opposition under Local Rule 25
141(c). 26 The Court has considered the factors set forth in *Oregonian Publishing Co. v. U.S.* 27
District Court for the District of Oregon, 920 F.2d 1462 (9th Cir. 1990). The Court finds that, for
28 the reasons stated in the Plaintiff’s request, sealing the 2023 Valuation Report and portions of
the 1 | reply brief serves a compelling interest. See, e.g., *Hefler v. Wells Fargo & Co.*, 2018 WL 2 |
4207245 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 4, 2018) (collecting cases) (“There are compelling reasons to keep this 3
| information confidential in order to prevent third parties from utilizing it for the improper
purpose 4 | of obstructing the settlement and obtaining higher payouts.”). The Court further finds

that, in the 5 | absence of closure, the compelling interests identified by Plaintiff would be harmed. In light of 6 | the public filing of its Notice to Seal, the Court further finds that there are no additional 7 | alternatives to sealing the 2023 Valuation Report and portions of the reply brief that would 8 | adequately protect the compelling interests identified by the Plaintiff. 9 Accordingly, it is ORDERED: 10 1. Plaintiff's unopposed request to seal documents (Doc. No. 162) is GRANTED. 11 2. Within five (5) days of this Order, Plaintiff shall provide an electronic copy of the 12 | document to be sealed to the Clerk of Court by email to: ApprovedSealed@caed.uscourts.gov, at 13 | which time the Clerk of Court will file the documents under seal. See Local Rule 141(e)(2)q). 14 ' | Dated: _ June 24, 2025 Mihaw. Wh. foareh Zaskth

16 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28