

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATTHEW WADE BEASLEY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00612-CDS-EJY

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Receiver Geoff Winkler’s Motion for Leave to Seal Appendix of Exhibit to Motion for Order to Show Cause Why Paula Beasley and Aaron Grigsby Should Not be Held in Contempt for Failure to Comply With This Court’s Orders and Alternative Motion for Turnover (ECF No. 500). The Motion to Seal explains that the documents sought to be sealed, which the Court reviewed, contain financial records containing personal identifying information and account information for Mrs. Beasley. The information is relevant to Plaintiff’s pending Motion for Order to Show Cause.

The party bringing a motion to seal must meet its burden of overcoming the strong presumption in favor of access and public policies favoring disclosure. *Kamakana v. City and Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that those who seek to maintain the secrecy of documents attached to dispositive motions must meet the high threshold of showing that “compelling reasons” support secrecy). The mere fact that production of records may lead to a party’s embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not alone compel the court to seal its records. *Foltz v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1136 (9th Cir. 2003). Compelling reasons require a demonstration of something more such as when court files have become a vehicle for improper purposes, including use of records to gratify private spite, promote public scandal, disseminate libelous statements, or circulate trade secrets. *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978).

1 Where a party seeks to seal documents attached to a non-dispositive motion, the “public  
2 policies that support the right of access to dispositive motions ... do not apply with equal force ...”  
3 *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178-1179 (citation omitted) (holding that those who seek to maintain the  
4 secrecy of documents attached to non-dispositive motions must demonstrate “good cause”  
5 supporting secrecy); see also *Phillips ex. rel. Estates of Byrd v. General Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d  
6 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002) (“For good cause to exist, the party seeking protection bears the  
7 burden of showing specific prejudice or harm will result if no protective order is granted.”).  
8 Ultimately, the Court must “conscientiously balance[] the competing interests of the public and the  
9 party who seeks to keep certain judicial records secret.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179 (quoting *Foltz*,  
10 331 F.3d at 1135) (alteration in original) (internal quotation marks omitted).

11 As stated, the Court reviewed the documents contained in the Appendix submitted by  
12 Receiver Geoff Winkler and finds good cause to seal the financial records therein.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Receiver Geoff Winkler’s Motion for Leave  
14 to Seal Appendix of Exhibit to Motion for Order to Show Cause Why Paula Beasley and Aaron  
15 Grigsby Should Not be Held in Contempt for Failure to Comply With This Court’s Orders and  
16 Alternative Motion for Turnover (ECF No. 500) is GRANTED.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that ECF No. 501 is and shall remain sealed.

18 Dated this 14th day of April, 2023.

19   
20 ELAYNA J. YOUCHAK  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28