

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4

5
6 JOHN DUGAN, et al.,

7 Plaintiffs,

8 v.

9 LLOYDS TSB BANK, PLC,

10 Defendant.

Case No.: [3:12-cv-02549-WHA](#) (NJV)

**ORDER RE CONFIDENTIAL
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 82 & 85

11
12 Lloyds TSB Bank, PLC (“Lloyds”) has addressed the issues this court raised in its
13 December 20, 2012 order (Doc. No. 83). *See* Doc. No. 85. The court orders as follows:

14 (1) The stipulated protective order may contain the two levels of confidentiality
15 designations urged by Lloyds.

16 (2) The term “competitor,” which Lloyds seeks to include in the definition of “expert,”
17 shall be limited to those competitors Lloyds identified in Exhibit A to Doc. No. 85.

18 (3) The parties may challenge confidentiality designations. *See, e.g.*, Doc. No. 82-1 at 8,
19 at ¶ 6. Plaintiffs may use a similar procedure to challenge the entities that Lloyds has identified as
20 competitors. The court urges the parties to meet and confer in earnest before seeking judicial
21 intervention regarding these matters.

22 (4) The parties shall file a revised stipulated protective order reflecting the above within
23 seven days.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: January 9, 2013

26 

27 Nandor J. Vadas
28 United States Magistrate Judge