

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

KATHERINE L. ZUNIGA,
Plaintiff,
v.
TRANS UNION, LLC, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:24-cv-00673-KES-EPG

ORDER DENYING, WITHOUT PREJUDICE,
JOINT MOTION FOR PROPOSED
STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER
(ECF No. 23)

This matter is before the Court on the parties’ joint motion for the Court to approve their proposed stipulated protective order. (ECF No. 23). Upon review, the Court will deny the motion without prejudice.

Among other things, the proposed order fails to address Local Rule 141.1(c), which sets out various requirements for a protective order. For example, the parties define “confidential” to mean “a document reasonably designated as confidential under th[e] protective order” and they propose to permit a document to be deemed confidential “if the party or non-party reasonably contends that it contains confidential or proprietary information.” (ECF No. 23, pp. 5-6). But such provisions improperly allow the parties to deem information confidential so long as they themselves believe that it qualifies for protection without ever disclosing the types of information at issue contrary to Local Rule 141.1(c)(1), which requires as follows: “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

1 of a troubled child).”

2 Additionally, the Court notes that “a protective order may not bind the Court or its
3 personnel.” *Rangel v. Forest River, Inc.*, No. EDCV 17-0613 JFW (SS), 2017 WL 2825922, at *2
4 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2017). Thus, to the extent that the protective order conflicts with the Court’s
5 established practices or Rules, e.g., such as allowing the parties to bypass the Court’s informal
6 discovery-dispute-resolution process, the Court’s established practices or Rules will govern.

7 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the parties’ motion for the Court to approve their
8 proposed stipulated protective order (ECF No. 23) is denied without prejudice.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10
11 Dated: August 28, 2024

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
/s/ Eric P. Gray
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE