

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Phil Davis v. Zuffa LLC, et al.

Davis · No. 2:25-cv-00946-RFB-BNW · Decided December 4, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada denied without prejudice the plaintiffs’ motions to seal exhibits related to discovery and a joint status report. The court directed the Clerk’s Office to keep the exhibits under seal pending resolution of defendants’ separate motions to seal.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Brenda Weksler
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 4, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00946-RFB-BNW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved to seal exhibits supporting a statement regarding missing discovery and exhibits to a joint status report. Defendants later filed motions seeking to seal the same documents.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Phil Davis v. Zuffa LLC, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether plaintiffs' motions to seal should be granted when they relied primarily on a stipulated protective order.
- Whether the documents should remain temporarily under seal while the defendants' later-filed motions to seal are considered.

HOLDINGS

1. A stipulated protective order alone does not justify sealing court records.
2. The Clerk's Office was directed to maintain ECF Nos. 85 and 88 under seal until further order while the court considers defendants' motions to seal.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Stipulated protective orders alone do not justify sealing court records.” (lines 15-16)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs submitted exhibits concerning missing discovery and an October 2025 joint status report and sought to keep those exhibits sealed. Plaintiffs relied on a stipulated protective order as the basis for sealing or redacting the documents, while defendants subsequently sought sealing of the same materials.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed motions to seal at ECF Nos. 84 and 87, relying on the parties' stipulated protective order. Defendants did not respond to those motions but filed their own motions to seal the same documents at ECF Nos. 90 and 95. The court denied plaintiffs' motions without prejudice and directed the Clerk's Office to maintain the identified exhibits under seal pending resolution of defendants' motions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1183 (9th Cir. 2006)