

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDREA VAN SCOY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. 2:08-cv-02237 MCE KJN

v.

NEW ALBERTSON’S, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER


Presently before the court is the parties’ “Stipulated Protective Order,” which seeks an order limiting the use and dissemination of information the parties seek to designate as “Protected Information” or as “Confidential.” (Dkt. No. 23.) For the reasons that follow, the undersigned will not approve the proposed stipulated protective order as drafted.

This court’s Local Rule 141.1 provides, in part, that “[e]very proposed protective order shall” contain certain provisions, including “[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.” Local Rule 144.1(d)(3). The parties’ proposed stipulated protective order does not contain this required showing. Accordingly, the undersigned will not approve the stipulation as proposed. However, the parties may file a stipulation and proposed order that meets all of the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the court’s Local Rules.

1 For the foregoing reasons, it is HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' "Stipulated  
2 Protective Order" is not approved.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: July 7, 2010

5  
6  
7   
8 KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26