4

1

2

3

7

6

8

10

11

1213

14

15

1617

18 19

2021

22 | 23 |

24

2526

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

ARMANDO ABREU,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-0763 FCD EFB P

VS.

F. BRAGA, et al.,

Defendants.

<u>ORDER</u>

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court are plaintiff's motions for a protective order to prevent defendants from deposing him on January 14, 2011. Dckt. Nos. 72, 73.

The purpose of a protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("Rule") 26(c) is to protect a party "from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense . . . ." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1). To obtain a protective order, the party resisting discovery or seeking limitations must show good cause for its issuance. *Id.* "For good cause to exist, the party seeking protection bears the burden of showing specific prejudice or harm will result if no protective order is granted." *Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002). "Broad allegations of harm, unsubstantiated by specific examples or articulated reasoning, do not satisfy the Rule 26(c) test." *Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d

470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992). Plaintiff requests the protective order to prevent "annoyance, oppression, [and] undue burden," yet presents no specific reasoning as to why being deposed would cause these results. *See* Dckt. No. 73 at 2. Plaintiff has failed to show good cause to justify a protective order, thus the motions are denied.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motions for a protective order (Dckt. Nos. 72, 73) are denied. Counsel for defendants shall provide a copy of this order to plaintiff at the deposition on January 14, 2011.

DATED: January 12, 2011.

EDMUND F. BRENNAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE