

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

JOHN DOE,

v.

Petitioner,

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, ET AL.,

Respondent

Motion for Leave to File Petition for Writ of Certiorari Including Redacted Copies of Previously Sealed Documents for the Public Record

To the Honorable Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Petitioner John Doe respectfully moves for leave to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari, including certain documents previously filed under seal in the lower courts, with redacted copies for the public record. Petitioner states as follows:

I. Introduction

1. Petitioner seeks review of the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in *John Doe v. University of Iowa, et al.*, No. 21-3340.
2. The Petition for Writ of Certiorari and accompanying Appendix include documents that were filed under seal in the lower courts to protect sensitive information.

3. These sealed documents are essential to the issues presented and necessary for the Court's full consideration of the case.
4. Petitioner has already printed and bound the Petition and Appendix in compliance with Supreme Court Rule 33.

II. Background

6. In the proceedings below, certain documents were filed under seal at Petitioner's request to safeguard sensitive information, including the identities of the parties and confidential details related to the case.
7. The lower courts granted these requests, and the documents remained under seal throughout those proceedings.
8. Quotations from these sealed documents are already included in the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, emphasizing their importance to the arguments presented.
9. Petitioner has prepared redacted versions of these documents for inclusion in the public record, omitting sensitive and personally identifiable information of complainants and respondents.
10. Petitioner consulted with the Clerk's Office of this Court regarding the inclusion of these documents and was advised to file this motion seeking leave to file redacted copies for the public record.

III. Argument

A. Necessity of Including the Sealed Documents

11. Excluding the sealed documents would significantly impair the Court's ability to fully understand and adjudicate the matters at hand.
12. The sealed documents are central to Petitioner's issues presented for review.

13. Reprinting the Petition without these documents would impose a substantial financial burden and delay, contrary to the interests of justice and judicial economy.

B. Acceptance of Redacted Copies is Appropriate

14. Supreme Court Rule 34.6 permits the inclusion of documents filed under seal in the appendix, provided that the order sealing them is included.

15. The redacted versions adequately protect the privacy interests of all parties and comply with the Court's requirements.

16. Given that the names and identifying details of complainants and respondents are redacted, making the documents available in the public record will not cause any issues or prejudice.

C. Balancing Public Access and Confidentiality

17. This approach serves the interests of justice and transparency without compromising the confidentiality of sensitive information, striking a balance between the public's right to access court documents and the need to protect certain information.

18. The Supreme Court recognizes that while there is a general right of public access to judicial records, this right is not absolute. See *Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597-98 (1978).

D. No Prejudice to Any Party

19. Allowing the redacted documents into the public record will not prejudice any party.

20. Respondents will have access to the unredacted materials, ensuring fairness in the proceedings.

21. The public will have sufficient information to understand the nature of the case without compromising confidential details.

E. Consistency with Prior Proceedings

22. Petitioner is not requesting that this Court place any new materials under seal.

23. Petitioner seeks to maintain the confidentiality protections previously established in the lower courts while providing redacted versions for the public record.

24. It is not currently known whether Respondent resists this Motion. So this Motion should be considered resisted.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant leave to file his Petition for Writ of Certiorari, including certain documents previously filed under seal in the lower courts, with redacted copies for the public record.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Rockne Cole

Rockne O. Cole
Cole Law Firm
200 S. West Street
P.O. Box 68
Ossian, IA 52161 (319)
519-2540
rocknecole@gmail.com
Counsel for Petitioner

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on October 22, 2024, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion for Leave to File Petition for Writ of Certiorari Including Redacted Copies of Previously Sealed Documents for the Public Record to be served Counsel for the Respondents by mail and email to: christopher.deist@ag.iowa.gov.

/s/ Rockne Cole

Rockne O. Cole
Cole Law Firm
200 S. West Street
P.O. Box 68
Ossian, IA 52161
(319) 519-2540
rocknecole@gmail.com
Counsel for Petitioner