

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

OPINION

Davis

PER CURIAM.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 4 ok 4 Phil Davis, Case No. 2:25-cv-00946-RFB-BNW 5 Plaintiffs,

‘ ORDER

7 Zuffa LLC, et al., 8 Defendants. 9 10 Plaintiffs filed a motion to seal certain exhibits in support of its statement regarding 11 || missing discovery (at ECF No. 83). ECF No. 84. They also filed a motion to seal certain exhibits 12 || to the October 2025 joint status report (at ECF No. 86). ECF No. 87. The sealed documents are 13 || currently at ECF Nos. 85 and 88. Plaintiffs rely on the protective order entered into by the parties 14 || as the rationale for sealing/redacting documents in both motions. Stipulated protective orders 15 || alone do not justify sealing court records. Kamakana vy. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 16 || 1183 (9th Cir. 2006). 17 Rather than respond to these motions, Defendants filed their own motions to seal the same 18 || documents identified in Plaintiffs’ motions. ECF Nos. 90 and 95. 19 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ motions to seal (ECF Nos. 84 and 87) 20 || are DENIED without prejudice. It appears it is Defendants who wish to maintain the documents 21 || in question under seal given the motions they filed at ECF Nos. 90 and 95. Thus, this Court will 22 || resolve those motions in due course. However, the Clerk’s Office is directed to maintain ECF 23 || Nos. 85 and 88 under seal until further orders from the Court. 24 25 DATED: December 4, 2025 26 27 i, wm les are fad

BRENDA WEKSLER □

28 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE