

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 17-1393 MLH (MRWx)	Date	November 28, 2017
Title	Powerbahn v. Zwift		

Present: The Honorable	Michael R. Wilner
Veronica Piper	n/a
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder
Attorneys Present for Petitioner:	Attorneys Present for Respondent:
None present	None present

Proceedings: ORDER RE: PROTECTIVE ORDER

The parties submitted a proposed protective order regarding discovery in this civil action. (Docket # 49.) The Court accepts and ENTERS the proposed order subject to the following:

1. ¶ 20 – Any challenge to a confidentiality designation must comply in full with the joint filing format described in Local Rule 37 for all discovery motions.
2. ¶ 27 – Deleted from protective order. This paragraph is inconsistent with the parties' proposal regarding inadvertent production, and fails to comply with the apply-for-under-seal-status requirements of Local Rule 79 and paragraph 28 of the order.
3. The parties failed to provide the Court with an adequate statement of good cause regarding the litigation. See Oliner v. Kontrabecki, 745 F. 3d 1024, 1026 (9th Cir. 2014). While the Court recalls that this is some sort of patent-related action, the proposed order does not adequately set forth the basis for the requested protections. As stated in the Court's preferred proposed protective order (available online at Judge Wilner's procedures page at cacd.uscourts.gov), the parties must identify legitimate bases for the entry of such an order that are specific to this action; no boilerplate allowed. The entry of this order is contingent on the filing of such a statement within five court days.
4. In the future, the parties are advised to consult the webpage of the assigned judges to determine whether they have a preferred base form protective order for the use of litigants. FYI, Judge Wilner's proposed order is derived from a recommendation from the Los Angeles County Bar Association's litigation section.