

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Sheikh v. DaVita Inc.

No. 2:25-cv-00111-TLN-CSK (E.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2025) · No. 2:25-cv-00111-TLN-CSK · Decided August 22,
2025

SUMMARY

This document is an order of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California granting the parties’ stipulated protective order in Sheikh v. DaVita Inc., Case No. 2:25-cv-00111-TLN-CSK. The order addresses the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, and disposition of confidential and highly confidential discovery materials. It clarifies that the court will not retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the action is closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chi Soo Kim
DECIDED	August 22, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00111-TLN-CSK
DISPOSITION	approved
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties submitted a stipulated protective order for court approval during discovery. The district court reviewed and approved the order subject to clarification concerning the court's jurisdiction after closure of the action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the stipulated protective order for compliance with relevant authorities and the court's Local Rule 141.1.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order with limited precedential value
PARTIES	Saira Sheikh v. DaVita Inc., DVA Renal Healthcare, Inc., Does 1 through 10

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties' stipulated protective order should be approved.
2. Whether the court would retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the underlying action is closed.

HOLDINGS

1. The court approved the parties' stipulated protective order because it comported with relevant authorities and the court's Local Rule 141.1.
2. The court would not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the protective order once the underlying case was closed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the terms of any protective order filed in that action.” (at 18-21)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The underlying action involves employment-related claims in which discovery was expected to include personal, medical, financial, proprietary, and other potentially confidential information. The parties stipulated to procedures governing designation, disclosure, use, sealing, challenges, and final disposition of protected discovery material. The court reviewed the proposed order and found it consistent with applicable authorities and Local Rule 141.1.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties jointly stipulated to a protective order and submitted it to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. Magistrate Judge Chi Soo Kim approved the protective order, clarifying that the court would not retain jurisdiction to enforce it after the case closed.

DISPOSITION

approved

CASES CITED

- Bylin Heating Sys., Inc. v. Thermal Techs., Inc., 2012 WL 13237584, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2012)