

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

PIERRE A. HASCHEFF,  
Appellant/Cross-Respondent,  
vs.  
LYNDA HASCHEFF,  
Respondent/Cross-Appellant.

No. 82626

**FILED**

**NOV 15 2021**

ELIZABETH A. BROWN  
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT  
BY S. Young  
DEPUTY CLERK

*ORDER*

This court previously entered an order denying, without prejudice, appellant/cross-respondent's (appellant) motion to file the opening brief and appendix under seal. The order noted that appellant failed to explain why redaction would not adequately protect any confidential information. This court also specifically directed that any renewed motion to seal documents should be accompanied by a copy of any district court order sealing documents.

Appellant has now filed a renewed motion to seal the opening brief and appendix. In support, appellant states the opening brief and appendix contain confidential information as well as references to, quotations from, and copies of documents sealed in the district court. Appellant appears to assert that the district court entered an order on October 14, 2013, sealing all documents that are included in the appendix. Respondent/cross-appellant (respondent) opposes the motion in part and appellant has replied.


Appellant fails to explain why redaction of the opening brief would be insufficient to protect any confidential information. Cf. SRCR 3(5)(b). Appellant also fails to provide this court with a copy of the district court's sealing order as directed or even inform this court on what basis the



district court sealed documents. Further, both appellant and respondent have already filed some of the documents appellant seeks to seal on this court's public docket, as attachments to their docketing statements. Under these circumstances, the motion is denied. The clerk shall reject the opening brief and appendix received on October 26, 2021.

Appellant shall have 7 days from the date of this order to file and serve any second renewed motion to seal or redact the opening brief and appendix. Any such motion must be accompanied by a copy of the district court's order sealing documents in the underlying proceedings. If appellant seeks to seal the opening brief, he must explain why redaction is insufficient to protect any confidential information therein. If appellant seeks to file the entire appendix under seal, he must explain why that is appropriate given that several documents in the proposed appendix are already on file on this court's public docket. Any motion must also be accompanied by the proposed opening brief and appendix. The proposed opening brief and appendix should be transmitted to this court via mail or personal service and will be kept confidential pending resolution of any motion to seal or redact. Should appellant file a motion to redact the opening brief, he must provide this court with both a redacted and an unredacted version of the document. If appellant files a motion to seal or redact and does not comply with the directives in this order, or does not demonstrate that sealing or redacting is appropriate, the opening brief and appendix may be filed on this court's public docket. If appellant will not be filing a motion to seal or redact, he shall file the opening brief and appendix within 7 days of the date of this order.

It is so ORDERED.

 C.J.

cc: Gordon & Rees Scully Mansukhani LLP/Reno  
Leonard Law, PC