

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CIVIL MINUTES--GENERAL

Case No. **EDCV 15-00290-JGB (KKx)**

Date: **March 3, 2016**

Title: **Roberta Nolan v. Saybrook University, et al.**

DOCKET ENTRY

PRESENT:

HON. KENLY KIYA KATO, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Deb Taylor
Deputy Clerk

n/a
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:

None present

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:

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 that the Court declines to issue the proposed protective order to which they have stipulated for the following reasons:

1. The stipulation needs to be revised to make clear that the terms of the Protective Order do not apply to the Court and court personnel, including court reporters and their staff, who are subject only to the Court's internal procedures regarding the handling of material filed or lodged, including material filed or lodged under seal.
2. The parties shall include a statement of good cause, as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). Such showing should be made separate from the parties' stipulation regarding the terms of the proposed protective order.
3. Proposed ¶ 6.2 needs to be revised to make clear that any motion challenging a party's designation of material as Confidential Information must be brought in strict compliance with Local Rules 37-1 and 37-2 (including the Joint Stipulation requirement). Reference in proposed ¶ 6.2 to Local Rule 79-5 appears to be

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES--GENERAL

Case No.: EDCV 15-00290-JGB (KKx)

Roberta Nolan v. Saybrook University, et al.

March 4, 2016

Page 2

unnecessary and confusingly duplicative of proposed ¶ 12.3 and should be removed.

4. Proposed ¶¶ 7.3 and 7.4 should be removed because they appear to be unnecessary and confusingly duplicative of proposed ¶ 12.3.
5. Proposed ¶ 14 should be revised to delete the following sentence: “However, any application or motion seeking contempt or injunctive relief must be presented to the District Judge.”
6. The signature block for the judge in the proposed Order needs to be changed to the signature block for the Magistrate Judge.

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. The parties are strongly encouraged to use the language contained in the approved stipulated protective order.

cc: District Judge Jesus G. Bernal