

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEFF YOUNG,
Plaintiff,
v.
CREE, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-06252-YGR (TSH)


ORDER RE PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 75

Defendant Cree, Inc., proposes a protective order and states that Plaintiff Jeff Young agrees to it. ECF No. 75. However, the dispute resolution procedure in paragraph 5 of the proposed order conflicts with the undersigned’s Discovery Standing Order. Specifically, paragraph 5 states that “[i]f the parties cannot in good faith resolve the dispute, the Receiving Party may move the Court for an order removing or changing the designation . . .” and that “[i]n addition, the challenging party may file a motion challenging a confidentiality designation at any time . . .,” whereas the Standing Order requires disputes such as those to be raised in a joint letter brief. The proposed protective order is therefore **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** to the submission of a proposed protective order that rephrases paragraph 5 to state that such disputes shall be raised in a joint letter brief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 18, 2019


THOMAS S. HIXSON
United States Magistrate Judge