

Time Warner Cable Enters. LLC v Nokia of Am. Corp.
2026 NY Slip Op 51013(U) [89 Misc 3d 1220(A)]
July 2, 2026
Supreme Court, New York County
Robert R. Reed, J.
Published by New York State Law Reporting Bureau pursuant to Judiciary Law § 431.
This opinion is uncorrected and will not be published in the printed Official Reports.

Digest-Index Classification: Records—Sealing of Records—Motion Papers and Attachments

Time Warner Cable Enterprises LLC, Plaintiff,

v

Nokia of America Corporation, Defendant.

Supreme Court, New York County

Decided on July 2, 2026

Index No. 650748/2022

ROBERT R. REED, J.

[*1]

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 017) 272, 273, 274, 278, 281 were read on this motion to/for SEAL.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 018) 275, 276, 277 were read on this motion to/for SEAL.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 019) 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337 were read on this motion to/for SEAL.

The following e-filed documents, listed by NYSCEF document number (Motion 020) 344, 345, 346, 347 were read on this motion to/for SEAL.

WHEREAS a summons and complaint were filed on February 16, 2022 (NYSCEF doc. nos. 1); and

WHEREAS, on April 11, 2025, plaintiff filed an application for an omnibus order to show cause seeking the sealing its summary judgment motion papers and twenty-three (23) attendant documents and exhibits filed thereto, including defendant's memorandum of law in support of its motion for summary judgment and forty-two (42) documents and exhibits annexed thereto (motion seq. no. 017); and

WHEREAS on April 15, 2025, defendant moved for an order requesting the identical relief as set forth in plaintiff's prior motion (motion seq. no. 18); and

WHEREAS on May 23, 2025, plaintiff filed an application for an order to show cause [*2] requesting the sealing of its memorandum of law in opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment, including all attendant documents and twenty-eight (28) exhibits, including defendant's memorandum of law in opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and fifteen (15) attendant documents and exhibits (motion seq. no. 019); and

WHEREAS on June 25, 2025 plaintiff filed an application for an order to show cause requesting sealing the memorandum of law filed in reply by both plaintiff and defendant (motion seq. no. 020).

NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with Section 216.1(a) of the Uniform Rules for Trial Courts, and in accordance with this court's discretion to determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether good cause exists to restrict public access (*Macheski v Gabelli Group Capital Partners*, [39 AD3d 499](#), 502 [2d Dept. 2007]), this court finds that movants have failed to sufficiently demonstrate a legitimate basis for the omnibus sealing of all motion papers filed in support of, and in opposition to summary judgment. The sealing of pleadings and motion papers is disfavored, and there is no showing that trade secrets are at risk of being divulged or that the motion papers would harm a business's competitive edge (*Mosallem v Berenson*, [76 AD3d 345](#), 348-49 [1st Dept 2010]). Movants' arguments regarding the "confidentiality" of the motion papers and arguments are unavailing.

However, with respect to a number of documents attached to the motion papers as exhibits, the court finds that "good cause" exists to restrict public access, as no substantial public interest would be furthered by access to that information (*Danco Labs v Chemical Works of Gedeon Richter*, 274 AD2d 1, 8 [1st Dept 2000]). Sealing portions of a court file may be appropriate to preserve the confidentiality of materials which involve internal finances, confidential contract terms, or other privacy rights of third parties who are not litigants herein (*Dawson v White & Case*, 184 AD2d 246, 247 [1st Dept 1992]; *Mancheski v Gabelli Group Capital Partners*, 39 AD3d at 502; *Ohrenstein & Brown, LLP*, 17 Misc 3d 1130[A], 2007 NY Slip Op 52207[U] [NY Sup Ct. NY County 2007]).

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an order sealing its summary judgment motion papers and twenty-three (23) attendant documents and exhibits filed thereto, including defendant's memorandum of law in support of its motion for summary judgment and forty-two (42) documents and exhibits annexed thereto (motion seq. no. 017) is granted to the limited extent of permitting the sealing of NYSCEF document numbers 197-212, 214-218, 222-229, 233-245, 248-269, and 271, and is otherwise denied; and it is further

ORDERED that defendant's motion (motion seq. no. 018), seeking the identical relief as plaintiff's previously filed order to show cause to seal (motion seq. no. 017), is denied as duplicative and moot; and

it is further

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an order sealing its memorandum of law in opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment, including all attendant documents and twenty-eight (28) exhibits, including defendants memorandum of law in opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and fifteen (15) attendant documents and exhibits (motion seq. no. 019) is granted to the limited extent of permitting the sealing of NYSCEF document numbers 289-314, and 318-331, and is otherwise denied; and it is further;

ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an order sealing the memorandums of law in reply filed by both plaintiff and defendant (motion seq. no. 020), is denied.

DATE July 2, 2026

ROBERT R. REED, J.S.C.

Links to or from other sites do not signify endorsement or relationship with them.
