

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES JOSHUA MAYFIELD, JAMES  
ALLISON MAYFIELD, JR. and TERRI  
MAYFIELD,

Plaintiffs,

v.

IVAN OROZCO, SHERIFF SCOTT  
JONES, JAMES LEWIS, RICK  
PATTISON, COUNTY OF  
SACRAMENTO, UNIVERISTY OF  
CALIFONRIA DAVIS HEALTH  
SYSTEM, DR. GREGORY SOKOLOV,  
DR. ROBERT HALES, and Does 1-5,

Defendants.

No. 2:13-CV-02499 JAM AC

PROTECTIVE ORDER

The parties' stipulated confidentiality agreement and protective order (ECF No 124), is  
APPROVED and INCORPORATED herein.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT:

1. Requests to seal documents shall be made by motion before the same judge who will  
decide the matter related to that request to seal.

2. The designation of documents (including transcripts of testimony) as confidential  
pursuant to this order does not automatically entitle the parties to file such a document with the  
court under seal. Parties are advised that any request to seal documents in this district is governed

1 by Local Rule 141. In brief, Local Rule 141 provides that documents may only be sealed by a  
2 written order of the court after a specific request to seal has been made. L.R. 141(a). However, a  
3 mere request to seal is not enough under the local rules. In particular, Local Rule 141(b) requires  
4 that “[t]he ‘Request to Seal Documents’ shall set forth *the statutory or other authority for sealing,*  
5 *the requested duration, the identity, by name or category, of persons to be permitted access to the*  
6 *document, and all relevant information.*” L.R. 141(b) (emphasis added).

7 3. A request to seal material must normally meet the high threshold of showing that  
8 “compelling reasons” support secrecy; however, where the material is, at most, “tangentially  
9 related” to the merits of a case, the request to seal may be granted on a showing of “good cause.”  
10 Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-1102 (9th Cir. 2016), petition  
11 for cert. filed, \_\_\_ U.S.L.W. \_\_\_ (U.S. March 24, 2016) (No. 15-1211); Kamakana v. City and  
12 County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-80 (9th Cir. 2006).

13 4. Nothing in this order shall limit the testimony of parties or non-parties, or the use of  
14 certain documents, at any court hearing or trial – such determinations will only be made by the  
15 court at the hearing or trial, or upon an appropriate motion.


16 5. With respect to motions regarding any disputes concerning this protective order which  
17 the parties cannot informally resolve, the parties shall follow the procedures outlined in Local  
18 Rule 251. Absent a showing of good cause, the court will not hear discovery disputes on an *ex*  
19 *parte* basis or on shortened time.

20 6. The parties may not modify the terms of this Protective Order without the court’s  
21 approval. If the parties agree to a potential modification, they shall submit a stipulation  
22 and proposed order for the court’s consideration.

23 7. Pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(f), the court will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement  
24 of the terms of this Protective Order after the action is terminated.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 DATED: July 28, 2016

27   
28 ALLISON CLAIRE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE