

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
4

5 SHAWN KUECK and TAYLOR KUECK,

6
7 Plaintiffs,

8 vs.

9 STEVENS COUNTY, et al.,

10 Defendants.
11

NO. 2:15-CV-00061-JLQ

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER

12
13 BEFORE THE COURT is the parties' Motion for Order Adopting Stipulation for
14 Protective Order (ECF No. 16) and the Stipulation and Proposed Order (ECF No. 17-1).
15 The Proposed Order defines "Protected Documents" as "all records contained in the
16 personnel files and disciplinary files for Michael Gilmore and MathewENZLER...".
17 Gilmore is a named Defendant in this matter, but ENZLER is not.

18 It is this court's general policy not to enter 'blanket' protective orders. The Ninth
19 Circuit also generally does not approve of 'blanket' protective orders. See Foltz v. State
20 Farm Auto Ins. Co., 331 F.3d 1122 (9th Cir. 2003) (finding it could not sustain the
21 district court's blanket protective order because the district court did not require a specific
22 showing as to particular documents). Rule 26(c) provides that upon a showing of "good
23 cause" the court may enter a protective order. "A party asserting good cause bears the
24 burden, for each particular document it seeks to protect, of showing that specific
25 prejudice or harm will result if no protective order is granted." Foltz, 331 F.3d at 1130.
26 No documents have been provided to the court for a determination of whether good cause
27 exists for a protective order.

28 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

ORDER - 1

