

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

MIGUEL ENRIQUE DIAZ,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
R. FOX, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-2705 JAM CKD P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights claim, has filed a motion for a protective order. (ECF No. 47.) Specifically, he seeks an order prohibiting his deposition and excusing him from producing documents which he contends are privileged.


The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide that a court may, “for good cause shown ... make any order which justice requires to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). The moving party must demonstrate “a particular and specific need for the protective order, as opposed to making stereotyped or conclusory statements.” Gray, 133 F.R.D. at 40. Whether to grant a protective order lies within the discretion of the court. See Kirshner v. Uniden Corp. of America, 842 F.2d 1074, 1079 (9th Cir. 1988). Here, plaintiff’s argument is comprised of conclusory statements and does not show good cause for the protective order he seeks.

////

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for protective order (ECF No. 47) is denied.

Dated: February 28, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2 / diaz2705.po