

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

RECEIVED

Peter D. Protopapas, as Receiver for Covil Corporation,
Respondent, Apr 17 2024

SC Court of Appeals

v.

Wall, Templeton & Haldrup, P.A.; Sentry Casualty
Company; United States Fidelity And Guaranty
Company; Zurich American Insurance Company,
Defendants

of which

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company is the
Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001437

ORDER

Respondent has filed a consent motion requesting this Court to seal certain confidential information included in Volume III of the Record on Appeal. "Judicial proceedings and court records are presumptively open to the public under the common law, the First Amendment of the federal constitution, and the state constitution." *Ex parte Capital U-Drive-It, Inc.*, 369 S.C. 1, 10, 630 S.E.2d 464, 469 (2006); S.C. Const. art. I § 9 ("All courts shall be public . . ."). Although there is no provision in the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules for sealing records in the appellate court, we have the power to control our own records. *See Ex parte Capital U-Drive-It, Inc.*, 369 S.C. at 10, 630 S.E.2d at 469. For guidance, we look to Rule 41.1(b), SCRCP, which requires a party asking to seal a record to identify, with specificity, the documents or portions of documents for which sealing is considered necessary, to include a non-confidential description of the documents, and to provide the court a separately sealed attachment labeled "Confidential Information to be submitted to Court in Connection with the Motion to Seal." The Rule also requires the moving party to state the reasons why sealing

is necessary, explain why less drastic alternatives to sealing will not afford adequate protection, and address the following factors:

- (1) ensuring the parties' right to a fair trial or hearing;
- (2) the need for witness cooperation;
- (3) the reliance of the parties upon expectations of confidentiality of the proceeding;
- (4) the public or professional significance of the proceeding;
- (5) the perceived harm to the parties from disclosure;
- (6) why alternatives other than sealing the documents are not available to protect legitimate private interests; and
- (7) why the public interest, including, but not limited to, the public health and safety, is best served by sealing the documents.

When ruling on a motion to seal, the court must also consider the public interest in the proceeding; the private or public status of the litigants and case generally; whether release would enhance the public's understanding of an important historical event; whether the public already has access to information contained in the records; whether a particular decision will sustain or offend the fundamental interests of public access, and any other relevant factors. *Ex parte Capital U-Drive-It, Inc.*, 369 S.C. at 12, 630 S.E.2d at 470 (2006).

After a full consideration of the factors enumerated above, Appellant's motion to seal Volume III of the Record on Appeal is granted.


FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Matthew Todd Carroll, Esquire
Mary Elizabeth O'Neill, Esquire
Robert G. Rikard, Esquire
Jescelyn Tillman Spitz, Esquire
Ashley K. Brathwaite, Esquire
G. Murrell Smith, Jr., Esquire
Jonathan M. Robinson, Esquire
Shanon N. Peake, Esquire
Mark Weston Hardee, Esquire

FILED
Oct 14 2021

Andrew T. Frankel, Esquire
Mary Beth Forshaw, Esquire