


1 Here, the parties' proposed stipulated protective order fails to address the requirements of
2 Local Rule 141.1(c). Moreover, although the parties' proposed stipulated protective order
3 addresses the filing of documents under seal with respect to the "law," and the "applicable rules
4 of court," the proposed stipulated protective order addresses neither the law nor the court's Local
5 Rules. In this regard, the parties are advised that, all documents filed with the court are
6 presumptively public. See San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. U.S. Dist. Court, 187 F.3d 1096, 1103
7 (9th Cir. 1999) ("It is well-established that the fruits of pretrial discovery are, in the absence of a
8 court order to the contrary, presumptively public.").

9 Therefore, documents that are the subject of a protective order may be filed under seal
10 only if a sealing order is first obtained. See Local Rule 141.1. A party seeking to obtain a sealing
11 order shall comply with the provisions of Local Rule 141, which sets forth a specific procedure
12 for seeking a sealing order. After compliance with Local Rule 141, the court will issue an order
13 granting or denying the request to seal.

14 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the parties' May 18, 2017 request for entry of the
15 proposed stipulated protective order (ECF No. 28) is denied without prejudice to renewal.

16 Dated: May 25, 2017

17
18
19 
20 DEBORAH BARNES
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22
23
24 DLB:6
25 DB\orders\orders.civil\parker0238.stip.prot.den
26
27
28