

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

Case No. **EDCV 17-867-JGB (KKx)**

Date: November 9, 2017

Title: ***Belen Torrez v. Freedom Mortgage Corporation, et al.***

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

DEB TAYLOR

Deputy Clerk

Not Reported

Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

None Present

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Present

Proceedings: Order re: Stipulated Protective Order [Dkt. 36]

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. Proposed ¶ 1 refers to paragraph 12.3, which does not appear to exist. It appears the parties are referring to Proposed ¶ 13.3. Similarly, Proposed ¶ 14 refers to "Section 4 (DURATION)", but Proposed ¶ 5 is the paragraph regarding duration. The stipulation needs to be revised to remedy the erroneous internal references.

2. Proposed ¶ 7 must be revised to make clear that any motion challenging a party's designation of material as Confidential Information, to retain a confidentiality designation, or seeking to modify or amend the proposed Protective Order must be brought in strict compliance with Local Rules 37-1 and 37-2 (including the Joint Stipulation requirement).

3. Proposed ¶ 13.3 needs to be revised to make explicit that a Party that seeks to file under seal any Protected Material must comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5.

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: United States District Judge Jesus G. Bernal