

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9
1011 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
1213 **ROBERT ANDREAS,**14 **CASE NO. 1:09-cv-02257-LJO-SKO**15 **Plaintiff,**16 **ORDER ON REQUEST FOR**
17 **STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER**18 **v.**19 **LOWE'S HIW, INC., a Washington**
20 **corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,**
21 **inclusive,**22 **Defendants.**23 **/**24 On July 16, 2010, the parties filed a stipulated request for a protective order regarding
25 confidential discovery materials. The Court has reviewed the stipulation and request for a protective
26 order. In its current form, the Court cannot grant the request for a protective order because the
27 stipulation and proposed order do not comply with *new* Local Rule ("L.R.") 141.1. Pursuant to L.R.
28 141.1(d), any proposed order submitted by the parties must contain the following provisions:29 (1) A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the
30 order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the
31 nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a
32 troubled child);
33 (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of
34 information proposed to be covered by the order; and
35 (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court
36 order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.37 Specifically, the stipulation and proposed order do not contain any showing as to why the
38

1 need for protection should be addressed by court order as opposed to a private agreement. If the
2 parties would like the Court to consider their stipulation and request, they are directed to refile a
3 stipulation and proposed order that complies with L.R. 141.1(d).

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

5 1. The parties refile a revised stipulation and proposed order for a protective order that
6 complies with L.R. 141.1(d).

7 2. If, upon further consideration, the parties determine that there is no need for a Court
8 order due to a private agreement between them, they shall withdraw their request for
9 a protective order.

10
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: July 16, 2010

13 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28