

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

HARTFORD CASUALTY INSURANCE
COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERICAN DAIRY AND FOOD
CONSULTING LABORATORIES, INC.,
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00914-OWW-SKO
ORDER ON REQUEST FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER

On June 22, 2010, the parties filed a stipulated request for a protective order regarding confidential discovery materials. The parties also filed a proposed order; however they did not email a copy of the proposed order so that it could be signed.

The Court has nevertheless reviewed the stipulated request for a protective order. In its current form, the Court cannot grant the request for a protective order because it does not comply with *new* Local Rule ("L.R.") 141.1. Pursuant to L.R. 141.1(d), any proposed order submitted by the parties must contain the following provisions:

- (1) A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child);
- (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the order; and

1 (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court
2 order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.

3 Specifically, the proposed order does not contain any showing as to why the need for
4 protection should be addressed by court order as opposed to a private agreement. If the parties would
5 like the Court to consider their stipulation and request, they are directed to refile a request for a
6 protective order that complies with L.R. 141.1(d).

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 8 1. The parties shall file a revised request for a protective order that complies with L.R.
9 141.1(d); and
10 2. The parties shall email a conforming copy of the proposed order to the Court in Word
11 or WordPerfect format to skoorders@caed.uscourts.gov.

12 If, upon further consideration, the parties determine that there is no need for a court order due
13 to a private agreement between them, they shall withdraw their request for a protective order.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: June 24, 2010

16 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28