

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

KHALID LANIER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF FRESNO, a municipal entity,
POLICE OFFICER ALFONSO
CASTILLO, in his individual and official
capacities, POLICE OFFICER STEPHEN
TAYLOR in his individual and official
capacities, COUNTY OF FRESNO, and
DOES 1-100, Jointly and Severally,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:10-cv-01120-LJO-SKO

**ORDER ON REQUEST FOR
STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER**

On August 1, 2011, the parties filed a stipulated request for a protective order regarding confidential discovery materials. The Court has reviewed the stipulation and request for a protective order. In its current form, the Court cannot grant the request for a protective order because the stipulation and proposed order do not comply with Local Rule ("L.R.") 141.1. Pursuant to L.R. 141.1(c), 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);

1 (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of
2 information proposed to be covered by the order; and

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

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

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

10 1. The parties shall refile a revised stipulation and proposed order for a protective order
11 that complies with L.R. 141.1(c) and email a conforming copy of the stipulation and
12 proposed order to skoorders@caed.uscourts.gov; and

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

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 **Dated:** August 2, 2011

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE