

WO

1

2

3

4

5

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Airbus DS Optronics GmbH, a foreign
company,

CV-14-2399-PHX-JAT

Plaintiff,

ORDER

vs.

Nivisys, LLC, a Delaware limited liability
company; XYZ Corporations, ABC
partnerships, and John and Jane Does 1-10,

Defendants.

16 On December 19, 2014, the Court entered the following Order:

17 The parties' have filed a stipulation for a protective order. In the
18 stipulation, the parties make no showing that a protective order is necessary
19 in this case. *See* Doc. 17.

20 Further, Global protective orders are not appropriate. *See AGA*
21 *Shareholders, LLC v. CSK Auto, Inc.*, 2007 WL 4225450, at *1 (D. Ariz.
22 Nov. 28, 2007). Rule 26(c) requires a party seeking a protective order to
23 show good cause for issuance of such an order. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1).
24 "For good cause to exist under Rule 26(c), 'the party seeking protection
25 bears the burden of showing specific prejudice or harm will result if no
26 protective order is granted.'" *AGA Shareholders*, 2007 WL 4225450, at *1
(emphasis added) (quoting *Phillips v. G.M. Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11
(9th Cir. 2002)). The party seeking protection "must make a 'particularized
showing of good cause with respect to [each] individual document.'" *Id.*
(emphasis added) (quoting *San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*,
187 F.3d 1096, 1102 (9th Cir. 1999)).

As a result of the foregoing,

IT IS ORDERED that the parties' stipulation for a protective order (Doc. 17) is denied without prejudice.


Doc. 18.

Thereafter, the parties submitted a second stipulation for the entry of a protective order. Doc. 19. In this second stipulation, the parties listed two documents that would be subject to the protective order, and articulated a basis for needing a protective order for these two documents. *Id.* at 1-2. However, the parties attached a proposed form of protective order that far exceeds the scope of their identified basis for needing a protective order. *See* 19-1 at 1-11.

Based on the foregoing,

IT IS ORDERED that the parties' second stipulation for entry of a protective order (Doc. 19) is denied without prejudice to the parties' filing a third stipulation for entry of a protective order in which the proposed form of order is consistent with the parties' articulated basis for requiring a protective order.

Dated this 29th day of January, 2015.


James A. Teilborg
Senior United States District Judge