

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

ELAINE K. VILLAREAL,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
COUNTY OF FRESNO and MARGARET  
MIMS,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-01410-DAD-EPG (PC)  
ORDER DENYING STIPULATION FOR  
PROTECTIVE, WITHOUT PREJUDICE  
(ECF No. 151)

On September 20, 2019, the parties filed a stipulation for a protective order. (ECF No. 151). The stipulation will be denied, without prejudice, because it does not comply with Local Rule 141 or Local Rule 141.1.

Paragraph four of the stipulation states that all documents subject to the stipulation that are filed with the Court shall be filed under seal. (ECF No. 151, p. 3). This does not comply with the requirements of Local Rule 141, which deals with the sealing of documents.

Additionally, the parties failed to comply with Local Rule 141.1(c). While the parties provided “[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),” they did not make “[a] showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the

1 order,” or “[a] showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court order, as  
2 opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.” Local Rule 141.1(c).

3 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the parties’ stipulation for a protective order is DENIED  
4 without prejudice.

5

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7

Dated: September 23, 2019

/s/ Eric P. Groj  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28