1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 7 AT SEATTLE 8 CRYSTAL MICALE, CASE NO. C24-806-RSM 9 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING STIPULATED MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE 10 ORDER v. 11 THE HARDWARE STORE, INC. d/b/a/ 12 JOHNSON'S HOME & GARDEN, et al., 13 Respondent. 14 15 This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Stipulated Protective Order. Dkt. #18. 16 The Court finds that the proposed Protective Order does not conform to the requirement 17 that its "protection from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or 18 items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles" as stated by 19 Local Rule 26(c)(2). Under the section entitled Confidential Material, the Court's model 20 protective order instructs: "[t]he parties must include a list of specific documents such as 21 'company's customer list' or 'plaintiff's medical records;' do not list broad categories of 22 documents such as 'sensitive business material.'" The parties have not followed this instruction 23 and instead include broad examples, including "[f]inancial documents with sensitive . . . 24

information[,]" "[d]ocuments containing sensitive, financial, or confidential information[,]" and "[a]ny other information not in the public domain that is reasonably and in good faith believe by the producing party to contain . . . highly sensitive information." Dkt. #18 at 2. Although some proper categories of documents are referenced, the Court finds that the parties have impermissibly left the door open to labeling a wide variety of documents as confidential, including categories that can be summed up as "sensitive business material." The parties submit no argument to justify this departure from the model protective order's guidelines, and the Court will not enter an order with such language. Given all of the above, the Motion will be denied. Having reviewed the instant Motion and remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that the parties Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. #18, is DENIED. DATED this 27th day of January, 2025. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE