

1
2
3
4
5
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8
9 SANDRA SANCHEZ,

Case No. 1:14-cv-00761-SKO

10 Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE STIPULATED
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

11 v.

12 (Doc. 19)

13 TARGET CORPORATION,

14 Defendant.
15 _____/

16
17
18 **I. INTRODUCTION**

19 On February 3, 2015, the parties filed a request seeking Court approval of their Stipulation
20 and Proposed Order for a Protective Order. (Doc. 19.) The Court has reviewed the proposed
21 stipulated protective order and has determined that, in its current form, it cannot be granted. For
22 the reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES without prejudice the parties' request to approve
23 the stipulated protective order.

24 **II. DISCUSSION**

25 **A. The Protective Order Does Not Comply with Local Rule 141.1(c)**

26 The proposed protective order does not comply with Rule 141.1 of the Local Rules of the
27 United States District Court, Eastern District of California. Pursuant to Rule 141.1(c), any
28 proposed protective order submitted by the parties must contain the following provisions:

- 1 (1) A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the
2 order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the
3 nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a
4 troubled child);
- 5 (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of
6 information proposed to be covered by the order; and
- 7 (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court
8 order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.

9 Local Rule 141.1(c). The stipulated proposed protective order fails to contain this required
10 information.

11 The parties fail to comply with Local Rule 141.1(c)(2) which requires “[a] showing of
12 particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the
13 order.” The parties have articulate their need for protection in only the vaguest of terms, that the
14 potential disclosure of these listed categories of documents “would have the effect of causing
15 harm.” (Doc. 19, 1.) No explanation is provided as to why a *particularized* need for protection is
16 required. Likewise, Local Rule 141.1(c)(3) requires that the parties show “why the need for
17 protection should be addressed by a court order, as opposed to a private agreement between or
18 among the parties.” The parties fail to address this requirement.

19 **B. The Parties’ Stipulated Protective Order is Denied Without Prejudice**

20 The parties may re-file a revised proposed stipulated protective order that complies with
21 Local Rule 141.1(c) and corrects the deficiencies set forth in this order.

22 **III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

23 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties’ request for approval of the
24 Stipulation and Proposed Order for a Protective Order (Doc. 19) is DENIED without prejudice to
25 renewing the request.

26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 Dated: February 12, 2015

28 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE