

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  
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MATTHEW CAMPBELL, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FACEBOOK INC.,

Defendant.

No. C 13-5996 PJH

**ORDER RE STIPULATED  
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Before the court is the parties' stipulated protective order, filed on April 14, 2015. Having reviewed the order, the court finds that two changes must be made, and thus DENIES the stipulated protective order in its current form. The parties are directed to re-submit the protective order with the following changes.

First, paragraph 4 provides that "[a]fter the final disposition of this action, this court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this order." The open-ended nature of the parties' phrasing suggests that the court will retain jurisdiction indefinitely. Instead, the revised order should place a temporal limitation on any retention of jurisdiction, not to exceed five (5) years after final disposition.

Second, paragraph 13(c) provides a procedure by which a party can compel the production of inadvertently-produced material, and requires that "[t]he motion shall be filed under seal." Elsewhere in the order, the parties acknowledge that any effort to file under seal must comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5 and General Order 62; however, this paragraph contains no such reference, creating confusion as to whether a party must first seek leave before filing its motion under seal. The revised order should specifically

1 reference Civil Local Rule 79-5 and General Order 62 within paragraph 13(c).

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: April 15, 2015



---

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge

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