

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

SANDIPKUMAR TANDEL,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S- 09-0842 MCE GGH

vs.

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,

ORDER

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

The parties have sought to have the court sign a protective order where documents designated by the parties as “confidential,” or “highly confidential” are automatically filed under seal. Some protective orders enable the parties to designate so much material as “confidential” that, in essence, entire case filings are sealed. The protective order submitted by the parties has the same potential problem. This court will not approve a protective order giving blanket authority to the parties to designate what shall be filed under seal.<sup>1</sup>

Discovery information disclosed in court filings generally is available to the public. See San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. United States Dist. Ct., 187 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir.1999) (“[i]t is well-established that the fruits of pre-trial discovery are, in the absence of a

<sup>1</sup> E.D. Cal. L.R. 140 and 141 deal with procedures to seal and not with the substantive standards for sealing.

1 court order to the contrary, presumptively public”).<sup>2</sup>

2 Protective orders safeguard the parties and other persons in light of the otherwise  
3 broad reach of discovery. United States v. CBS, Inc., 666 F.2d 364, 368-69 (9th Cir. 1982). The  
4 court has great discretion to issue protective orders if discovery causes annoyance,  
5 embarrassment, oppression, undue burden, or expense. B.R.S. Land Investors v. United States,  
6 596 F.2d 353, 356 (9th Cir. 1979). Good cause, however, is required to obtain a protective order.  
7 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c); Foltz v State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1130 (9th Cir.  
8 2003); Phillips v. General Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210 (9th Cir. 2002) (“Generally, the  
9 public can gain access to filed litigation documents and information produced during discovery  
10 unless the party opposing disclosure shows ‘good cause’ why a protective order is necessary”).

11 “Good cause” to bar the public from litigation documents must be more than  
12 mere desire. The party seeking protection must show specific prejudice or harm, including, with  
13 respect to individual documents, particular and specific need. Id.; San Jose Mercury News, Inc.,  
14 187 F.3d at 1102; W.W. Schwarzer, A.W. Tashima & J. Wagstaffe, Federal Civil Procedure  
15 Before Trial § 11:88. “If a court finds particularized harm will result from disclosure of  
16 information to the public, then it balances the public and private interests to decide whether a  
17 protective order is necessary.” Phillips, 307 F.3d at 1211 (citing Glenmade Trust Co. v.  
18 Thompson, 56 F.3d 476, 483 (3d Cir.1995) (factors)).

19 Indeed, when a protective order seeks to protect judicial records in dispositive  
20 matters from public scrutiny, a higher “compelling reasons” standard applies – even “good  
21 cause” is insufficient. Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass’n., 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010).

22 By this time counsel should be aware that they cannot simply stipulate to file any  
23 documents they wish under seal. See E.D. Local Rules 140, 141 and cases cited herein. If the  
24

---

25 <sup>2</sup> A party may have the right to protect from public disclosure information which has  
26 been produced to the other party only because of discovery and which has not been filed with the  
court. Seattle Times v. Rhinehart, 467 U.S. 20, 33, 37, 104 S. Ct. 2199, 2207, 2209 (1984).

1 parties desire a protective order to be filed in this court, the parties shall submit a protective order  
2 which permits a filing under seal only upon a particularized showing of good cause, or if the  
3 information sought to be protected is to be used in potentially dispositive matters, a showing of  
4 compelling reasons.

5                   Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the parties' proposed stipulated protective  
6 order (dkt. #44), is denied without prejudice to submission of a proper proposed order.

7 Dated: February 7, 2011

                  /s/ Gregory G. Hollows                  

U.S. Magistrate Judge

8  
9 GGH:076/Tandel0842.po.wpd

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26