

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Velazquez v. Nissan North America, Inc.

Velazquez · No. 2:25-cv-00246-CSK · Decided August 13, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is an Eastern District of California order approving a modified stipulated protective order in Olga Velazquez v. Nissan North America, Inc., Case No. 2:25-cv-00246-CSK. The order addresses confidentiality designations, disclosure and use of protected discovery material, challenges to designations, filing under seal, final disposition, and sanctions for violations. The court clarified that it 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	Amir Nassihi
DECIDED	August 13, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00246-CSK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties submitted a stipulated protective order for approval during discovery in a pending federal civil action.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court order approving a stipulated protective order.

TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure Discovery and confidentiality Commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the stipulated protective order should be approved under the applicable authorities and Local Rule 141.1.
- Whether the court would retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the underlying action was closed.

HOLDINGS

1. The court approved the parties' stipulated protective order, subject to the stated clarification regarding post-closure jurisdiction.
2. The court will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the protective order once the underlying case is closed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court *APPROVES* the protective order, subject to the following clarification.” (at 1)

“Thus, the Court will not retain jurisdiction over this protective order once the case is closed.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The underlying action was expected to involve confidential, proprietary, commercial, financial, technical, and private information in discovery. The parties jointly sought a protective order governing the designation, use, disclosure, filing, and disposition of protected discovery material. The court reviewed the stipulated order and modified it to clarify that the court would not retain jurisdiction to enforce it after the action closed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties stipulated to a protective order and submitted it to the Eastern District of California. The court reviewed the proposed order, approved it subject to a clarification concerning post-closure jurisdiction, and entered the modified protective order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Bylin Heating Sys., Inc. v. Thermal Techs., Inc., 2012 WL 13237584, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2012)
- Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)