

1 **document.”** *Id.* (emphasis added) (quoting *San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*,
2 187 F.3d 1096, 1102 (9th Cir. 1999)).

3 Thus, “[t]he burden is on the party to requesting a protective order to demonstrate
4 that (1) the material in question is a trade secret or other confidential information within the
5 scope of Rule 26(c), and (2) disclosure would cause an identifiable, significant harm.” *Foltz*
6 *v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1131 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting *Deford v.*
Schmid Prods. Co., 120 F.R.D. 648, 653 (D. Md. 1987)).

7 Here, while the parties have offered categories of documents they intend to mark as
8 confidential; they have failed to make a particularized showing as to what such documents
9 would be or why the documents would qualify for protection under Federal Rule of Civil
10 Procedure 26(c). Therefore,

11 **IT IS ORDERED** that the stipulation for protective order (Doc. 28) is denied
12 without prejudice.

13 Dated this 14th day of December, 2015.

14
15 
16 James A. Teilborg
17 Senior United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23