

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

GOLDEN ROAD MOTOR INN, INC., A
NEVADA CORPORATION; D/B/A
ATLANTIS CASINO RESORT SPA,
Appellants/Cross-Respondents,
vs.
SUMONA ISLAM, AN INDIVIDUAL,
Respondent/Cross-Appellant,
and
MEI-GSR HOLDINGS LLC, A NEVADA
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY D/B/A
GRAND SIERRA RESORT WHICH
CLAIMS TO BE THE SUCCESSOR IN
INTEREST TO NAV-RENO-GS, LLC,
Respondents.

No. 64349

FILED

OCT 03 2014

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY S. Young
DEPUTY CLERK

SUMONA ISLAM, AN INDIVIDUAL,
Appellant,

No. 64452

vs.
GOLDEN ROAD MOTOR INN, INC., A
NEVADA CORPORATION D/B/A
ATLANTIS CASINO RESORT SPA,
Respondents.

MEI-GSR HOLDINGS LLC, D/B/A
GRAND SIERRA RESORT,
Appellant/Cross-Respondent,

No. 65497

vs.
GOLDEN ROAD MOTOR INN, INC., A
NEVADA CORPORATION, D/B/A
ATLANTIS CASINO RESORT SPA,
Respondent/Cross-Appellant.

*ORDER DIRECTING SUPPLEMENT TO
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL*

On September 2, 2014, appellant/cross-respondent Golden Road Motor Inn, LLC filed a motion to maintain treatment of portions of the appendix as sealed, asserting that the documents that are sought to be filed under seal were the subject of a protective order in the district court

because they contained confidential proprietary information and trade secrets.¹ See SRCR 3(4)(g) (providing that sealing records may be proper “to protect intellectual proprietary or property interests such as trade secrets”); SRCR 7 (“Court records sealed in the trial court shall be sealed from public access in the Nevada Supreme Court subject to further order of that court.”). In the motion, Golden Road appears to request that this court file Volumes 4-6, 9-10, and 12-28 of the 28-volume appendix under seal. Based on our review of these volumes, however, it is not clear that all of the documents contained within these volumes were sealed in the district court, as only certain documents contain notations that they were filed under seal or other indications of confidentiality. Thus, appellant/cross-respondent shall have 11 days from the date of this order to file and serve a supplement to the motion to seal, identifying which portions of the proposed sealed volumes were filed under seal in the district court. See SRCR 3(6) (explaining that when entering an order to seal portions of a court record, “the court shall use the least restrictive means and duration”). We defer ruling on the motion to seal pending receipt and consideration of the supplement.

It is so ORDERED.

 _____, C.J.

cc: Law Offices of Mark Wray
Laxalt & Nomura, Ltd./Reno
Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg
Cohen-Johnson LLC

¹The clerk of this court shall revise the caption for Docket Nos. 64349 and 64452 to conform to the caption on this order.