

1 confidential so long as they themselves believe that it qualifies for protection and without ever
2 disclosing the types of information at issue under Local Rule 141.1(c)(1), which requires “[a]
3 description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description
4 provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list,
5 formula for soda, diary of a troubled child).” Therefore, the Court will limit the parties’ definition
6 of confidential information to the following types of documents: confidential business or
7 financial information, information regarding confidential business practices, or other confidential
8 research, development, or commercial information (including information implicating privacy
9 rights of third parties).

10 Additionally, the Court notes that “a protective order may not bind the Court or its
11 personnel.” *Rangel v. Forest River, Inc.*, No. EDCV 17-0613 JFW (SS), 2017 WL 2825922, at
12 *2 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2017). Thus, to the extent that the protective order conflicts with the
13 Court’s established practices or Rules, e.g., such as by allowing the parties to bypass the Court’s
14 informal discovery-dispute-resolution process, the Court’s established practices or Rules will
15 govern. (See ECF No. 26 at 3-4 (noting procedures regarding informal discovery conferences and
16 discovery motions); the Court’s Standard Procedures (same), available on the Court’s website)).

17 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the parties’ stipulation for a protective order (ECF
18 No. 40) is granted, in part, as revised above.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: March 11, 2025

21 /s/ Eric P. Gray
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28