

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEJANDRO REYES CRUZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

VICTOR VILLARNEAL, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-00962-CRB](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Plaintiff Alejandro Reyes Cruz (“Cruz”), representing himself pro se, brings three motions for a protective order in this case. See dks. 9, 16, 19.¹ The first and third motion appear to be similar protective orders drafted by Cruz, while the second motion appears to be the district’s model protective order, which only Cruz has signed. See id.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) controls whether and when the imposition of a protective order is appropriate. This rule states that “[t]he court may, for good cause, issue an order to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense” with several listed examples, each having to do with discovery or exchange of information between parties. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1).

Cruz’s request for a protective order in this case is premature. No defendant has appeared; therefore, no exchange of information that may be protected by a protective order can take place. Cruz has not demonstrated good cause for a protective order at such an early stage.²

¹ Cruz is advised against filing multiple duplicative motions seeking the same relief. Successive, redundant filings clog up the Court’s docket and delay prompt resolution of motions.

² Cruz’s drafted protective order indicates that he seeks a preemptive protective order because he fears retaliation from law enforcement. See dks. 16, 19. If Cruz can set forth specific facts demonstrating good cause underlying this concern, he may refile a motion for a protective order after defendants have appeared and the parties begin exchanging sensitive information. Any

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, Cruz’s motions for a protective order are denied without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 20, 2023



CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge

motions for protective orders filed before that time will not be entertained.