

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 DEREK STENSON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 KING COUNTY, et al.,

14 Defendants.  
15

CASE NO. C23-1316 MJP

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED  
PROTECTIVE ORDER

16 This matter comes before the Court on the Parties' Stipulated Protective Order. (Dkt. No.  
17 13.) Having reviewed the Order and all supporting materials, the Court DENIES entry of the  
18 Order without prejudice.

19 The Court appreciates that the Parties have submitted a proposed protective order that  
20 largely tracks the District's Model Protective Order. But the Parties propose an overbroad and  
21 vague definition of "confidential material" to include "[a]ny other material enjoying special legal  
22 protection from disclosure that is relevant to the claims or defenses in this case." As the Model  
23 Protective Order instructs, the Parties "must include a list of specific documents such as  
24


1 ‘company’s customer list’ or ‘plaintiff’s medical records;’” and may not “list broad categories of  
2 documents such as “sensitive business material.” Model Stipulated Protective Order at 2,  
3 available at  
4 <https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/ModelStipulatedProtectiveOrder.pdf>. The  
5 Court will consider a more specific and narrow definition of “confidential material” that tracks  
6 the Model Protective Order and identifies specific documents, rather than an open-ended and  
7 overbroad category of documents.

8 The Court also rejects the Parties’ proposed “Acknowledgment.” The Parties have  
9 revised and altered the language of the “Acknowledgment” from the Model Protective Order in  
10 material ways that do not appear to be either necessary or prudent. Without some explanation as  
11 to why the proposed revisions are necessary, the Court rejects this deviation from the Model  
12 Protective Order. The Court will consider a revised “Acknowledgment” that mirrors the one  
13 included in the Model Protective Order.

14 For these two reasons, the Court DENIES the Order without prejudice. The Court will  
15 consider entry of a revised Stipulated Protective Order that addresses the Court’s concerns set  
16 forth in this Order.

17 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

18 Dated November 13, 2023.

19 

20 Marsha J. Pechman  
21 United States Senior District Judge  
22  
23  
24