UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

AUDRA BORING,

Case No. 1:16-CV-00869

Plaintiff,

v.

OPINION & ORDER [Resolving Doc. 48]

PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On October 7, 2016, the parties filed a joint motion for a protective order. The protective order would "allow Defendants to provide Plaintiffs with access to documents and information. . . while protecting confidential information contained therein." Neither the motion nor the proposed order, however, specifically identify what type of information warrants a protective order. While the Court would consider a motion to protect policy holders' personal identifying information, the motion as written is unduly broad. Therefore, the Court **DENIES** the motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 11, 2016

s/ James S. Gwin
JAMES S. GWIN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Doc. <u>48</u>.

² Id.

³ The motion relies on form language in the Court's Civil Rules Appendix L: "Any party may designate documents . . . that contain information protected from disclosure by statute or that should be protected from disclosure as confidential personal information, medical or psychiatric information, trade secrets, personnel records or such other sensitive commercial information that is not publicly available." Id.