UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No.	**EDCV 16-1261-KK**	Date:	December 5, 2016
Title:	***Randy Conan, et al. v. City of Fontana, et al.***		

Present: The Honorable   KENLY KIYA KATO, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEB TAYLOR	Not Reported
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):	Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):
None Present	None Present

Proceedings: Order re: Stipulated Protective Order [Dkt. 31]

The Court is in receipt of the parties' proposed Stipulation and Protective Order. ECF Docket No. 31. The parties are advised that the Court declines to issue the proposed protective order to which they have stipulated for the following reasons:

1.   Proposed ¶¶ 10 and 12 need to be revised to make clear that any motion challenging a party's designation of material as Confidential Information, seeking to modify or amend the proposed Protective Order, or seeking to designate additional items as being covered by the proposed Protective Order must be brought in strict compliance with Local Rules 37-1 and 37-2 (including the Joint Stipulation requirement).

2.   Proposed ¶ 9 needs to be revised to include the following language: "Notwithstanding this provision, Counsel are entitled to retain an archival copy of all pleadings, motion papers, trial, deposition, and hearing transcripts, legal memoranda, correspondence, deposition and trial exhibits, expert reports, attorney work product, and consultant and expert work product, even if such materials contain Protected Material. Any such archival copies that contain or constitute Protected Material remain subject to this Protective Order until further order of the Court."

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.

IT IS SO ORDERED.