

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

BARRY STRAWN,

CASE NO. 1:10-cv-02254 – SKO

Plaintiff,

**ORDER ON REQUEST FOR
STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER**

v.

FEDERAL EXPRESS CORPORATION
LONG TERM DISABILITY PLAN,

Defendant.

On October 28, 2011, the parties filed a stipulated request for a protective order regarding confidential discovery materials. (Doc. 35.) 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(c).

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);
- (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 If the parties would like the Court to consider their stipulation and request, they are directed
4 to refile a stipulation and proposed order that complies with L.R. 141.1(c).

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' request for a stipulated protective
6 order is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 **Dated:** November 2, 2011

9 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE