FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 01/10/2020 02:21 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 574

INDEX NO. 452044/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/10/2020

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK

In the matter of:))
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK) Index No.: 0452044/2018
) MOTION) TO UNSEAL
Plaintiff,) [Proposed Intervention) Pleading Pursuant to
v.) CPLR 1014]
EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION)
Defendant,)
and)
ENERGY POLICY ADVOCATES,)
and)
ROBERT SCHILLING,)
Interested Parties.)

NOW COME the intervenors, ENERGY POLICY ADVOCATES and ROBERT SCHILLING, and move to unseal certain of the pleadings in this proceeding. In support of this Motion, intervenors state as follows:

1. It is long-settled in New York that there is a broad common-law right of public access to judicial documents, and an even more expansive right of access under the First Amendment. See, e.g., *People v. Burton*, 189 AD2d 532, 535-36, 597 N.Y.S.2d 488, 491-92 (3rd 1993) citing,

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 01/10/2020 02:21 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 574

INDEX NO. 452044/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/10/2020

Nixon v. Warner Communications, 435 U.S. 589, 597-598 (1978), and a long line of cases including United States v. Mitchell, 551 F.2d 1252, 1260 (D.C. Cir. 1976), Newsday, Inc. v. Sise, 71 NY2d 146, 153 n.4, 524 N.Y.S.2d 35 (1987), Rushford v. New Yorker Magazine, Inc., 846 F.2d 249, 253 (4th Cir.1988), In Matter of New York Times Co., 828 F.2d 110, 114 (2d Cir. 1987), U.S. v. Haller, 837 F.2d 84 (2nd Cir.1988).

- 2. In this matter, numerous documents have been sealed and are not available for viewing by the public. This includes not only exhibits subject to discovery dispute or reserved for *in camera* review, but even allegations and affirmative defenses found in the Defendant's answer itself. Intervenors specifically seek access to Exxon Mobil's Amended Answer (NYSCEF Doc. No. 241) and briefs with exhibits filed as NYSCEF Doc. Nos. 142, 144, 235 and 236.
- 3. Federal Courts have held that "If there is a request for access to inspect sealed documents, that request must be heard by the Court." See *Matter of Searches of Semtex Indus*. *Corp.*, 876 F. Supp. 426, 429 (E.D.NY 1995).
- 4. "When the First Amendment is properly invoked to seek access to a court proceeding or documents filed in connection thereto, the Court may deny the application '..only by proof of a compelling governmental interest' and proof that the denial is narrowly tailored to serve that interest," *People v. Macedonio*, 2016 NY Slip Op 50718(U) (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2016), citing *Matter of EyeCare Physicians of America*, 100 F.3d 514, 519 (7th Cir.1996).
- 5. When the Common-Law Right of Access is at issue, a court is still required to "balance the competing considerations in favor of and against sealing." *People v. Macedonio*, 2016 NY Slip Op 50718(U) (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2016), citing *United States v. Smith*, 985 F. Supp. 2d 506 (S.D.NY 2013).

COUNTY CLERK 01/10/2020

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 574

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/10/2020

INDEX NO. 452044/2018

6. In the instant case, certain documents being withheld from the public are not only important to a vital public policy debate over policy and the increasing employment of state attorneys general at the request of private interests and to assist private ends. They also implicate both the First Amendment and the Common-Law Right of Access. The Public cannot fairly

scrutinize the activities of the government without access to the sealed records in this case.

7. Interested parties have standing to seek unsealing of judicial documents. See Furtado v.

Henderson, [2018 BL 463193], 2018 WL 6521914 (D. Mass. Nov. 26, 2018); Barrow v. Living

Word Church, No. 3:15-CV-341 (S.D. Ohio Aug. 16, 2016); Doe v. Does, No. 1:16-CV-7359

(N.D. Ill. Mar. 11, 2019); Parson v. Farley, 352 F. Supp. 3d 1141, 1147 Okla. 2018).

8.` The federal appellate courts have "routinely found... that third parties have standing to

challenge protective orders and confidentiality orders in an effort to obtain access to information

or judicial proceedings." Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg, 23 F.3d 772, 777 (3d Cir. 1994).

WHEREFORE, Intervenors move this Court for an order that:

(a) Unseals heretofore sealed portions of the record in this matter, specifically pleadings

that have been filed in this Court.

(b) Sets forth the specific factual findings that justify redaction of any remaining sealed

documents.

Dated this the 10th day of January, 2020.

LAW OFFICE OF FRANCIS MENTON

Attorney for the Petitioners

 $/_{\rm S}/$

Francis Menton

85 Broad Street, 28th floor

New York, New York 10004

(212) 627-1796

fmenton@manhattancontrarian.com

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 01/10/2020 02:21 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 574

INDEX NO. 452044/2018

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 01/10/2020

Matthew D. Hardin*
324 Logtrac Road
Stanardsville, VA 22973
(434) 202-4224
MatthewDHardin@gmail.com
*pro hac vice to be filed