

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

CORY LARSON, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HARMAN-MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00219-DAD-SKO

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE PROPOSED STIPULATED
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

(Doc. 55)

I. INTRODUCTION

On January 20, 2017, the parties filed a request seeking Court approval of their Proposed Stipulated Protective Order. (Doc. 55.) The Court has reviewed the Proposed Stipulated Protective Order and has determined that, in its current form, it cannot be granted. For the reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES *without prejudice* the parties' request to approve the Proposed Stipulated Protective Order. (*Id.*)

II. DISCUSSION

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

The Proposed Stipulated Protective Order does not comply with Rule 141.1 of the Local Rules of the United States District Court, Eastern District of California. Pursuant to Rule 141.1(c), any proposed protective 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
information proposed to be covered by the order; and
- 2 (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court
3 order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.

4 Local Rule 141.1(c).

5 The Proposed Stipulated Protective Order does not comply with subsections (2) and (3) of
6 Local Rule 141.1(c). Specifically, the parties fail to include in the proposed order any “showing
7 of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by
8 the order,” or any “showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court
9 order, as opposed to a private agreement.” (See Doc. 55, Ex. 1.) Absent the requisite showing
10 pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(c)(2) and (3), the Court cannot enter the Proposed Stipulated
11 Protective Order filed by the parties.

12 **B. The Parties’ Proposed Stipulated Protective Order is Denied Without**
13 **Prejudice**

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

16 **III. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

17 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties’ request for approval
18 of the Proposed Stipulated Protective Order, (Doc. 55), is DENIED *without prejudice*.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: January 24, 2017

21 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE