

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

MARIA EVA MARTINEZ,

Case No. 1:16-cv-01140-DAD-SKO

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE STIPULATED  
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

v.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY,

(Doc. 44)

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**I. INTRODUCTION**

On March 28, 2017, the parties filed a request seeking Court approval of their stipulated Protective Order. (Doc. 44.) 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 stipulated protective order.

**II. DISCUSSION**

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

The proposed 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);
- (2) A showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the order; and
- (3) A showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.

