

at 1149). A requirement for motion for leave to seal is to “establish that interests which favor non-disclosure outweigh the public interest in access to court documents.” *Sibley v. Sprint Nextel Corp.*, 254 F.R.D. 662, 667 (D. Kan. 2008) (citing *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 599 (1978)). For good cause to be established, “a moving party must submit particular and specific facts, and not merely ‘stereotyped and conclusory statements.’” *Id.* (citation omitted).

Plaintiff has made no attempt to discuss why interests favoring non-disclosure outweigh the public interest in access to these court exhibits. He has not explained why the deposition transcript should be considered confidential. “Although the exhibits [Plaintiff] seeks leave to file under seal may very well meet these standards, [Plaintiff] must first provide this information.” *Rajala v. McGuire Woods, LLP*, No. 08-2638-CM, 2012 WL 12932558, at *1 (D. Kan. Dec. 14, 2012).

As such, Plaintiff’s motion (Doc. 97, sealed) is **DENIED without prejudice**. The parties are instructed that any future motions seeking leave to file under seal must meet the requirements discussed herein.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion to File Deposition Under Seal (Doc. 97, sealed) is **DENIED without prejudice**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 29th day of September, 2020, at Wichita, Kansas.

S/ KENNETH G. GALE
HON. KENNETH G. GALE
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE