UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA FORT WAYNE DIVISION

JENNICA WALDRON,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) CAUSE NO. 1:11-CV-217
BED BATH & BEYOND, INC.,)
Defendant.)

OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is a Motion for Protection of Confidential Information filed by Defendant, seeking approval of a proposed protective order pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). (Docket # 19.) Because the proposed order (which is limited to the discovery phase of the proceedings) is a deficient in one respect, it will be DENIED.

Paragraph 11 of the proposed order states that it shall continue to be binding after the conclusion of the litigation, suggesting that the Court will retain jurisdiction. However, "[t]he Court is unwilling to enter a protective order that requires the Court to retain jurisdiction of any kind after the resolution of the case." *E.E.O.C. v. Clarice's Home Care Serv., Inc.*, No. 3:07-cv-601 GPM, 2008 WL 345588, at *2 (S.D. Ill. Feb. 7, 2008) (encouraging the parties to make a contractual agreement among themselves for the return of sensitive documents without court oversight); *see also Large v. Mobile Tool Int'l, Inc.*, No. 1:02-CV-177, 2010 WL 3120254, at *1 (N.D. Ind. Aug. 6, 2010).

"Obtaining a protective order in an appropriate case need not be a[n] onerous task. But

such an order may not issue absent an appropriate showing of good cause, as well as adherence

to the other limitations the Seventh Circuit has emphasized apply to such orders." Shepard v.

Humke, IP 01-1103-C-H/K, 2003 WL 1702256, at *2 (S.D. Ind. Mar. 28, 2003). For these

reasons, the Court DENIES approval of Defendant's proposed protective order (Docket # 19).

Of course, the parties may submit a revised protective order that cures the identified deficiency

and is consistent with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1) and Seventh

Circuit case law.

SO ORDERED.

Enter for this 21st day of May, 2012.

S/ Roger B. Cosbey

Roger B. Cosbey,

United States Magistrate Judge

2