

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

UNICO MECHANICAL CORP, a
California Corporation, and ALFRED
CONHAGEN, INC. OF CALIFORNIA, a
California Corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KAMALA HARRIS, in her official
capacity of Attorney General for the State
of California; CHRISTINE BAKER, in her
official capacity as the Director of the
California Department of Industrial
Relations; DIANE RAVNIK, in her official
capacity as the Chief of the California
Division of Apprenticeship Standards; and
MATT RODRIGUEZ, in his official
capacity as California Secretary for
Environmental Protection,

Defendants.

STATE BUILDING AND
CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA, AFL-CIO,

Intervenor-Defendant

No. 2:15-cv-0996 JAM AC (TEMP)

ORDER

On December 2, 2015, this matter came before the undersigned for hearing of intervenor-defendant's motion to modify a protective order. Attorney Jonathan Barker appeared telephonically on behalf of the plaintiffs and attorneys Scott Kronland and Zoe Palitz appeared in

1 person on behalf of the intervenor-defendant.¹

2 Upon consideration of the arguments on file and at the hearing, and for the reasons set
3 forth on the record at the hearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that intervenor-defendant's
4 October 6, 2015 motion to modify (Dkt. No. 21) is DENIED.

5 It is FURTHER ORDERED as follows:

- 6 1. In the event of a dispute regarding the designation of any discovery material as
7 confidential, pursuant to paragraph 8 of the protective order filed on August 28, 2015,
8 (Dkt. No. 15), the parties shall meet and confer in compliance with the procedures
9 outlined in the undersigned's "Standard Information," which includes the instructions
10 regarding "Discovery Disputes." See
11 [www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac)
12 [magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac.](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac)²
- 13 2. If, after meeting and conferring, a dispute remains, the party challenging a
14 confidentiality designation shall file a notice of motion that (a) specifically identifies
15 the material at issue, in conformity with paragraph 8 of the protective order; (b) briefly
16 sets forth the nature of the challenge; (3) summarizes the moving party's effort to
17 resolve the dispute informally; and (4) notices the motion for hearing before the
18 undersigned on no less than 28 days' notice.
- 19 3. The provisions of Local Rule 251(c), regarding joint statements, shall not apply to
20 such a dispute. Instead, the designating party shall file a statement making a showing
21 of good cause for the confidentiality designation no later than 14 days prior to the date
22 of the hearing. A courtesy copy, with any declarations, exhibits and other attachments
23 tabbed, shall be delivered to the Clerk of Court on the day of filing.

24 ///
25 ///
26 _____


27 ¹ No appearance was made by, or on behalf of, the State defendants and those defendants did not
28 oppose the intervenor-defendant's motion to modify.

² The parties are directed to review the undersigned's "Standard Information," and comply with
 all provisions set forth therein.

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

4. The party challenging the designation shall file a reply no later than 7 days prior to the date of the hearing. A courtesy copy shall be filed if the document exceeds 20 pages or any attachments exceed 10 pages.

DATED: December 2, 2015



ALLISON CLAIRE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE