

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Magistrate Judge Boyd N. Boland

Civil Action No. 14-cv-00728-WJM-BNB

CLAY HAMADY RAMPONE,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, a Colorado municipal corporation,
SERGEANT IAN CULVERHOUSE, in his individual and official capacity,
OFFICER JESSE REMBERT, in his individual and official capacity,
SERGEANT DAVE COLAIZZI, i his individual and official capacity,
SERGEANT MIKE CODY, Denver Police Department, Internal Affairs Bureau, in his
individual and official capacity, and
COMMANDER JOHN BURBACH, Denver Police Department, Internal Affairs Bureau, in his
individual and official capacity,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter arises on defendants' **Motion for Protective Order** [Doc. # 29, filed 6/26/2014]. The defendants seek the entry of a blanket protective order, generally consistent with the requirements of Gillard v. Boulder Valley School Dist., 196 F.R.D. 382 (D. Colo. 2000). In support of their motion, the defendants represent that “[t]he nature of the claims, defenses and damages asserted in this lawsuit involves discovery of documents and information containing Confidential Information.” Motion for Protective Order [Doc. # 29] at ¶1. In fact, the plaintiff’s claims involve allegations of excessive police force, false arrest, unreasonable seizure, destruction of exculpatory evidence and manufacture of inculpatory evidence, malicious prosecution, and conspiracy. In cases like this, it is not unusual for discovery to include personnel files, internal affairs investigation files, and other materials which may be confidential.

Entry of a blanket protective order facilitates discovery of confidential information while reserving to the other side the right to challenge whether the information is properly maintained confidentially or may be made public.

The plaintiff was given an opportunity to respond to the Motion for Protective Order, see Minute Order [Doc. # 31], but he failed to do so.

I am persuaded that the entry of a blanket protective order is appropriate here.

IT IS ORDERED:

(1) The Motion for Protective Order [Doc. # 29] is GRANTED. A protective order will enter separately; and

(2) The hearing on the Motion for Protective Order set for July 11, 2014, at 2:30 p.m., is VACATED.

Dated July 10, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland
United States Magistrate Judge