

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

David Sanchez Banaga v. State of California, by and through
California Highway Patrol, and Does 1-10, inclusive

Banaga v. State of California · No. 5:24-cv-02681-SSS-DTB · Decided May 21, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered in David Sanchez Banaga v. State of California, by and through the California Highway Patrol, in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. It governs the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and disposition of confidential discovery materials. The order was stipulated to and signed by counsel on May 21, 2025, and ordered by Magistrate Judge David T. Bristow.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David T. Bristow
DECIDED	May 21, 2025
DOCKET	5:24-cv-02681-SSS-DTB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery material, and the court entered the order pursuant to the stipulation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) to enter a stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material.

2. What conditions should govern the designation, disclosure, use, challenge, filing, retention, and disposition of protected discovery material.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause existed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) to protect specified confidential discovery materials, including personal data, medical and mental-health information, medical reports and photographs, and certain law-enforcement records, policies, and procedures.
2. Protected discovery material may be used only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the litigation; may be disclosed only to authorized persons subject to the order; and must be specifically designated and handled according to the order's procedures.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The parties acknowledge that this Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery and that the protection it affords from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles.” (at 1)

“Once a case proceeds to trial, all the information and documents used during trial that was designated as confidential or maintained under this Order becomes public and will be presumptively available to all members of the public, including the press, unless the trial judge finds compelling reasons to proceed otherwise.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action's anticipated discovery was likely to involve confidential, proprietary, private, medical, mental-health, identifying, and law-enforcement information. The court found that disclosure of such material could create risks including embarrassment, oppression, physical harm, officer-safety concerns, security issues, or interference with investigations, and entered a protective order to govern its use and disclosure.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff David Sanchez Banaga filed this federal civil-rights action against the State of California, by and through the California Highway Patrol, and Does 1-10. During discovery, the parties submitted a stipulated protective order, which Magistrate Judge David T. Bristow approved and ordered entered on May 21, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Sanchez v. City of Santa Ana, 936 F.2d 1027, 1033 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Kerr v. United States District Court for the Northern District of California, 511 F.2d 192, 198 (9th Cir. 1975), aff'd, 426 U.S. 394 (1976)
- Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)

