## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES--GENERAL** 

Case No. **EDCV 14-02094-VAP (KKx)** 

Date: **July 17, 2015** 

Title: Philadelphia Indemnity Insurance Co. v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc., et al.

## **DOCKET ENTRY**

PRESENT:

## HON. KENLY KIYA KATO, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:

None present None present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS)** 

The parties' proposed Stipulation and Protective Order has been referred by the District Judge to the Magistrate Judge for consideration. The parties are advised the Court declines to issue the proposed protective order to which they have stipulated for the following reason:

1. Proposed ¶ 6.3 remains deficient for the reasons set forth in this Court's June 9, 2015 Order. The proposed paragraph needs to be revised to make clear that any motion challenging a designation of material as Confidential or requesting a modification of the Protective Order will need to be made in strict compliance with Local Rules 37-1 and 37-2 (including the Joint Stipulation requirement).

The parties are further directed to the Court's sample stipulated protective order located on the Court's website for a sample of the format of an approved stipulated protective order.