

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

AZIZ SAFOUANE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STEPHEN HASSETT, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C00-0621-JCC

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for a Protective Order (Dkt. No. 264), the Responses by Defendants Molly Daggett and Lutheran Social Services ("LSS") (Dkt. No. 265) and the Washington State Defendants (Dkt. No. 266), and Plaintiffs' Reply (Dkt. No. 270). The Court has carefully considered these documents and the balance of pertinent materials in the case file and has determined that oral argument is not necessary. The Court finds and rules as follows.

Plaintiffs circulated a proposed stipulated protective order, hoping to come to an agreement with Defendants about designating as "confidential" certain types of documents that may be produced during discovery. (Mot. 2 (Dkt. No. 264).) While the King County Defendants apparently failed to respond at all, Daggett/LSS and the State Defendants expressly rejected Plaintiffs' request to enter the stipulation. (*Id.* at 2–3.) Thereafter, Plaintiffs filed the instant motion, asking that the Court enter Plaintiffs' proposed protective order. Daggett/LSS and the State Defendants object on several grounds, mainly that

ORDER – 1

1 Plaintiffs have not demonstrated good cause for the protective order and that this district's Local Rules
2 regarding sealing already provide a method for the protection of potentially confidential information
3 from public disclosure and therefore, the motion is unnecessary.

4 The Court is not inclined to enter a blanket protective order that has not been stipulated to by the
5 parties. The Court does, however, encourage the parties to cooperate in working out the details of a
6 proposed stipulated protective order to facilitate discovery. In the meantime, or failing such an
7 agreement, if Plaintiffs seek a protective order to prevent discovery of particular documents or seek to
8 seal certain documents filed with the Court, Plaintiffs may so move the Court with the appropriate
9 showing of good or compelling cause. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 26(c); Local Rule W.D. Wash. CR5(g). In
10 fact, it appears that the State Defendants have already filed a motion to seal certain documents that
11 would likely have been covered by the proposed protective order. (*See* Motion to File Documents Under
12 Seal (Dkt. No. 284).) The parties are reminded that certain information, such as dates of birth, names of
13 minor children, and financial accounting information, some of which is also sought to be protected by
14 the proposed order, are to be redacted from court filings in accordance with Local Rule W.D. Wash. CR
15 5.2. At this stage, the Court does not find good cause to enter the broad proposed protective order and
16 therefore DENIES Plaintiffs' motion (Dkt. No. 264).

17 DATED this 27th day of March, 2009.

18
19
20
21 
22 John C. Coughenour
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25