

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Sacramento County Employees’ Retirement System v. Telus Health,
LTD.

Sacramento County Employees’ Retirement System · No. 2:24-cv-01431-JAM-SCR · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

This document is an order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California approving and incorporating the parties’ stipulated protective order, subject to specified conditions. It addresses sealing requests, confidentiality designations, discovery disputes, modifications, and the court’s jurisdiction over enforcement after termination of the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sean C. Riordan
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	2:24-cv-01431-JAM-SCR
DISPOSITION	approved
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered the parties’ stipulated protective order and entered an order approving and incorporating it, subject to additional and conflicting provisions set out in the court’s order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential interlocutory protective order

TOPICS

discovery dispute evidence civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure Discovery Evidence Sealing and protective orders

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should approve and incorporate the parties’ stipulated protective order.
2. What procedures and standards govern requests to seal documents covered by the protective order.
3. What procedures govern disputes concerning the protective order and inadvertently produced materials.

4. Whether the parties may modify the protective order without court approval and whether the court will retain jurisdiction to enforce it after termination of the action.

HOLDINGS

1. The stipulated protective order is approved and incorporated into the court's order except to the extent it is inconsistent with the court's additional provisions.
2. Requests to seal documents must be made by motion before the judge who will decide the matter related to the sealing request, and a confidentiality designation under the protective order does not itself authorize filing under seal.
3. A request to seal material ordinarily must satisfy the compelling-reasons standard, but a good-cause showing may suffice when the material is only tangentially related to the merits of the case.
4. Unresolved disputes concerning the protective order, including disputes regarding inadvertently produced materials under Federal Rule of Evidence 502, must follow the procedures in Eastern District of California Local Rule 251; absent good cause, the court will not hear such discovery disputes ex parte or on shortened time.
5. The parties may not modify the protective order without court approval, and the court will not retain jurisdiction to enforce its terms after the action is terminated.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The designation of documents (including transcripts of testimony) as confidential pursuant to this order does not automatically entitle the parties to file such a document with the court under seal." (at 1)

"A request to seal material must normally meet the high threshold of showing that "compelling reasons" support secrecy; however, where the material is, at most, "tangentially related" to the merits of a case, the request to seal may be granted on a showing of "good cause."" (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties entered into a stipulated protective order governing confidential material in this civil action. The court approved and incorporated that stipulation but imposed additional requirements concerning sealing requests, discovery disputes, modifications, and post-termination enforcement. The order also addressed the treatment of inadvertently produced materials under Federal Rule of Evidence 502.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties submitted a stipulated protective order identified as ECF No. 43. The district court approved and incorporated the stipulation, required that sealing requests comply with the court's local rules, established procedures for protective-order and discovery disputes, and disapproved any conflicting provision of the stipulation.

DISPOSITION

approved

CASES CITED

- Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-1102 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 137 S. Ct. 38 (2016)
- Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-80 (9th Cir. 2006)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 SACRAMENTO COUNTY No. 2:24-cv-01431-JAM-SCR EMPLOYEES'
RETIREMENT SYSTEM, 12 Plaintiff, 13 PROTECTIVE ORDER v. 14 TELUS HEALTH, LTD.,
15 Defendant. 16 17 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties' Stipulated Protective Order
(ECF No. 43), is 18 APPROVED and INCORPORATED herein, except as inconsistent with the
below.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT: 20 1. Requests to seal documents shall be made by
motion before the same judge who will 21 decide the matter related to that request to seal. 22 2.
The designation of documents (including transcripts of testimony) as confidential 23 pursuant to
this order does not automatically entitle the parties to file such a document with the 24 court under
seal.

Parties are advised that any request to seal documents in this district is governed 25 by E.D. Cal.
R. ("Local Rule") 141. In brief, Local Rule 141 provides that documents may only 26 be sealed by
a written order of the court after a specific request to seal has been made. Local 27 Rule 141(a).

However, a mere request to seal is not enough under the local rules. In particular, 28 Local Rule
141(b) requires that "[t]he 'Request to Seal Documents' shall set forth the statutory or 1 || other
authority for sealing, the requested duration, the identity, by name or category, of persons 2 || to be
permitted access to the document, and all relevant information." Local Rule 141(b) 3 || (emphasis
added).

4 3. A request to seal material must normally meet the high threshold of showing that 5 ||
"compelling reasons" support secrecy; however, where the material is, at most, "tangentially 6 ||
related" to the merits of a case, the request to seal may be granted on a showing of "good cause." 7
| Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-1102 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 137
8 || S.Ct.

38 (2016); Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-80 (9th Cir. 9 | 2006).
10 4. Nothing in this order shall limit the testimony of parties or non-parties, or the use of 11 ||

certain documents, at any court hearing or trial — such determinations will only be made by the court at the hearing or trial, or upon an appropriate motion.

5. With respect to a motion regarding any dispute concerning this protective order which the parties cannot informally resolve, including any disputes regarding inadvertently produced materials under Fed. R. Evid. 502, the parties shall follow the procedures outlined in Local Rule 251. Absent a showing of good cause, the court will not hear discovery disputes on an ex parte basis or on shortened time.

6. The parties may not modify the terms of this Protective Order without the court's approval. If the parties agree to a potential modification, they shall submit a stipulation and proposed order for the court's consideration. 7. Pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(f), the court will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the terms of this Protective Order after the action is terminated.

8. Any provision in the parties' stipulation (ECF No. 43) that is in conflict with anything in this order is hereby DISAPPROVED. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: April 13, 2026
SEAN C. RIORDAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE