

# United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

---

No. 25-10224  
Summary Calendar

---

United States Court of Appeals  
Fifth Circuit

**FILED**

June 11, 2025

Lyle W. Cayce  
Clerk

BLACKS IN TECHNOLOGY, INTERNATIONAL,

*Plaintiff,*

*versus*

PETER BEASLEY,

*Count-Defendant—Appellant.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Texas  
USDC No. 3:20-CV-3008

---

Before DENNIS, HO, and OLDHAM, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:\*

Paul Beasley appeals the district court's denial of a motion to seal. The district court, after conducting a line-by-line analysis and weighing Beasley's interest in nondisclosure against the public's right of access, denied the request to seal. For the following reasons, we AFFIRM.

---

\* This opinion is not designated for publication. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.

No. 25-10224

We have appellate jurisdiction to review the denial of a motion to seal under the collateral order doctrine. *Vantage Health Plan, Inc. v. Willis-Knighton Medical Center*, 913 F.3d 443, 448-49 (5th Cir. 2019). We review the district court’s decision to seal documents for an abuse of discretion. *United States v. Holy Land Found. for Relief & Dev.*, 624 F.3d 685, 689 (5th Cir. 2010). “The decision whether to allow public access to court records ‘is one best left to the sound discretion of the trial court, a discretion to be exercised in light of the relevant facts and circumstances of the particular case.’” *Vantage Health Plan, Inc.*, 913 F.3d at 450 (citing *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 599 (1978)).

Beasley challenges the district court’s decision not to seal an exhibit capturing an email chain between parties, detailing publicly available legal information about him. The district court first rejected Beasley’s argument that the emails were irrelevant, as the information in the email was central to claims in this litigation. The district court also rejected Beasley’s contention that the email chain was filed to spite him, as he provided no support for this accusation. Finally, the district court rejected Beasley’s argument that the email contained private, personal information, as much of the email chain cites to public court proceedings, which are public by definition. *See June Med. Servs., L.L.C. v. Phillips*, 22 F.4th 512, 520 (5th Cir. 2022) (“Publicly available information cannot be sealed.”). Ultimately, the district court found that neither the information in the email chain nor Beasley’s arguments overcame the public’s right of access to court records. On this record and given that we “heavily disfavor sealing information placed in the judicial record,” we can find no abuse of discretion in the district court’s denial of Beasley’s request to seal the exhibit. *Id.* at 519–520.

The district court court’s denial of the motion to seal is AFFIRMED.