Palmer v. losefa et	al	Doc	46
	CHAIN COHN STILES		
1	David K. Cohn (SBN 68768)		
2	Email: dcohn@chainlaw.com Neil K. Gehlawat (SBN 289388)		
3	Email: ngehlawat@chainlaw.com 1731 Chester Avenue		
4	Bakersfield, CA 93301		
5	Telephone: (661) 323-4000 Facsimile: (661) 324-1352		
6			
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11			
12	ROBERT PALMER,	CASE NO. 1:16-CV-00787-SKO	
13	Plaintiff,	STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER	
14	v.		
15	CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL		
16	OFFICER IOSEFA; CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL OFFICER		
17	CRELOSE; CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY		
18	PATROL OFFICER MCCONNELL; and Does 1 to 10, inclusive,		
19	Defendants.		
20			
21	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by all parties to this action by and through their attorneys of		
22	record, that the documents described herein shall be designated as "Confidential" and if produced		
23	subject to the following Protective Order:		
24	Categories of documents described as follows:		
25	(a) Personnel records produced by the Department of Insurance (or any other law		
26	enforcement agency in which Plaintiff Robert Palmer may have worked) in response to		
27	Defendants' subpoena for records related to Plaintiff Robert Palmer; and		
28			
		-1-	,
		Dockets.Justia.	com

(b) Any and all portions of personnel records of California Highway Patrol Officer Peniamina Iosefa that may be produced in this action per court order or otherwise.

- 2. The categories of documents designated as "Confidential" contain information that is not available to the public, statutorily protected under state law and information in which the parties, and potentially other individuals, have a privacy interest in.
- 3. A Court-approved protective order is appropriate pursuant to Local Rule 141.1 because Defendants' employing agency, a third party, does not believe it can lawfully waive its perceived statutory duties to protect the confidentiality of the materials subject to this order without the imprimatur of the Court.
- 4. The disclosed documents shall be used solely in connection with the civil action of Robert Palmer v. California Highway Patrol Officer Iosefa, et al., E.D. Cal. Case No. 1:16-CV-00787-SKO. The parties do not waive any objections to the admissibility of the documents or portions thereof in future proceedings in this action, including trial.
- 5. A party may designate any further documents as "Confidential" which it has determined in good faith to be: (a) confidential or potentially invasive of an individual's privacy interests; (b) not generally known; and (c) not normally revealed to the public or third parties or, if disclosed to third parties, such that third parties would be required to maintain the information in confidence. By designating a document or portion thereof as "Confidential," the party making the designation avers that it can and would make a showing to the Court sufficient to justify entry of a protective order covering that document or portion thereof under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 and Eastern District of California Local Rule 141.1.
- 6. A party producing the documents described herein may designate those documents as confidential by affixing a mark labeling them "Confidential," provided that such marking does not obscure or obliterate the content of any record. If any confidential documents cannot be labeled with this marking, those documents shall be placed in a sealed envelope or other container that is in turn marked "Confidential" in a manner agreed upon by the disclosing and requesting parties.

7.

"Confidential" are not, in fact, confidential. Prior to applying to the Court for such an order, the party seeking to reclassify Confidential information shall meet and confer with the producing party. Until the matter is resolved by the parties or the Court, the document in question shall continue to be treated according to its designation under the terms of this Protective Order. The producing party shall have the burden of establishing the propriety of the "Confidential" designation. A party shall not be obligated to challenge the propriety of a confidentiality designation at the time made, and a failure to do so shall not preclude a subsequent challenge thereto.

A party may apply to the Court for an order that information or materials labeled

- 8. Documents designated under this Protective Order as "Confidential" may be disclosed only to the following persons:
 - (a) All counsel of record and attorneys in the offices of said counsel;
- (b) Paralegal, clerical, and secretarial personnel regularly employed by counsel referred to in subpart (a) immediately above, including stenographic deposition reporters or videographers retained in connection with this action;
- (c) Court personnel, including stenographic reporters or videographers engaged in proceedings as are necessarily incidental to the preparation for the trial of this action;
 - (d) Any expert, consultant, or investigator retained in connection with this action;
 - (e) Any "in-house" expert designated by Defendant to testify at trial in this matter;
- (f) The parties to this action who have affirmatively agreed in writing to be bound by this Protective Order;
- (g) Witnesses who may have the documents disclosed to them during deposition proceedings; the witnesses may not leave the depositions with copies of the documents.
 - (h) Any neutral evaluator or other designated ADR provider; and
- (i) The finder of fact at the time of trial, subject to the Court's ruling on in limine motions and objections of counsel.

9. Prior to the disclosure of any "Confidential" documents to any person identified in Paragraph 8(d)-(g), each such recipient of "Confidential" documents shall be provided with a copy of this Protective Order, which he or she shall read. Upon reading this Protective Order, such person shall acknowledge in writing as follows:

I have read the Protective Order that applies in Robert Palmer v. California

Highway Patrol Officer Iosefa, et al., E.D. Cal. Case No. 1:16-CV-00787-SKO

and shall abide by its terms. I consent to be subject to the jurisdiction of the

United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, including

without limitation in any proceeding for contempt.

- 10. The following procedures shall be utilized by the parties making copies of documents designated as "Confidential":
- (a) The producing party shall provide one copy of the "Confidential" documents to the receiving party.
- (b) The receiving party shall not furnish, disclose, or otherwise divulge any the "Confidential" documents to any source, except those persons identified in Paragraph 8 herein, without further order of the Court or authorization from counsel for the producing party.
- (c) If any document designated as "Confidential" pursuant to this Protective Order is used or disclosed during the course of a deposition, that portion of the deposition record reflecting such material shall be stamped with the appropriate designation and access shall be limited pursuant to the terms of this Protective Order. The court reporter will be directed to bind those portions of the transcript that contain discussion of the contents of the "Confidential" documents separately. The cover of any portion of a deposition transcript that contains testimony or documentary evidence that has been designated "Confidential," including exhibits designated as "Confidential," will be marked: CONFIDENTIAL/SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER.
- 11. Should any documents designated "Confidential" be disclosed, through inadvertence or otherwise, to any person not authorized to receive the documents under this Protective Order, the disclosing person(s) shall promptly: (a) inform the producing party of the recipient(s) and the

circumstances of the unauthorized disclosure, and (b) use best efforts to bind the recipient(s) to the terms of this Protective Order. No document shall lose its "Confidential" status because it was inadvertently or unintentionally disclosed to a person not authorized to receive it under this Protective Order.

- 12. The "Confidential" documents produced pursuant to this Order will be redacted with respect to any purely confidential identifying personal and family information.
- 13. If a party would like to use "Confidential" documents in Court filings, at least seven (7) days notice shall be given to all parties. The parties shall comply with the requirements of Eastern District Local Rule 141, in the event that a party would like "Confidential" document to be sealed. The Parties agree a request to seal or remove the designation of "Confidential" may be heard on shortened time and/or by telephone conference with a showing of good cause.
- 14. Nothing in this Order shall in any way limit or prevent "Confidential" documents from being used in any deposition or other proceeding in this action. In the event that any "Confidential" document is used in any deposition or other proceeding in this action, it shall not lose its confidential status through such use. If any "Confidential" document is used in a deposition, then arrangements shall be made with the court reporter to separately bind such portions of the transcript containing information designated as "CONFIDENTIAL" and to label such portions appropriately.
- 15. This Protective Order is entered for the purpose of facilitating the exchange or documents between the parties to this action without involving the Court unnecessarily in the process. Nothing in this Protective Order, or the production of any document under the terms of this Protective Order, shall be deemed to have the effect of an admission or waiver by either party or of altering the confidentiality or non-confidentiality of any such document.
- 16. Nothing in this Protective Order shall in and of itself require disclosure of information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege, work-product doctrine, or any other privilege, doctrine, or immunity, nor does anything in this Order, result in any party giving up its right to

-6-

CHAIN | COHN | STILES By: /s/ Neil K. Gehlawat Neil K. Gehlawat Attorneys for Plaintiff OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA By: /s/ Neli N. Palma Peter A. Meshot Neli N. Palma Attorneys for Defendants

1	ORDER
2	
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: July 5, 2017 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
5	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	7