

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES S. POBURSKY, et al.,)	1:07cv0611 AWI DLB
)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’
)	MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER
v.)	WITHOUT PREJUDICE
)	(Document 204)
MADERA COUNTY, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiffs James S. and Wanda Pobursky (“Plaintiffs”) filed the instant motion for a protective order on July 28, 2010. The matter was heard on September 17, 2010, before the Honorable Dennis L. Beck, United States Magistrate Judge. Plaintiffs appeared on their own behalf. Valerie Velasco appeared on behalf of Defendants County of Madera, Richard Ackerman, James Adkins, Brian Cunnings, Karl Hancock, Chris Swanson and Jacob Tallmon (“Defendants”).

Plaintiffs’ protective order seeks to prevent the depositions of their three minor children, Joshua, Elisha and Christiana. The motion was filed on July 28, 2010, the day their children were scheduled to be deposed. Defendants opposed the motion on August 6, 2010.

DISCUSSION

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1) permits the Court to prohibit or limit discovery in order to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression or undue burden or expense. There is a heavy burden on the moving party to demonstrate good cause for

1 a protective order and to show why discovery should be denied. Blankenship v. Hearst Corp.,
2 519 F.2d 418, 429 (9th Cir. 1975).

3 As explained at the hearing, there are no pending depositions scheduled for the children.
4 The motion is therefore DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. Plaintiffs may renew the motion if
5 Defendants notice the children's depositions.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 **Dated: September 27, 2010**

/s/ Dennis L. Beck
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28