

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.

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
12 | court at the hearing or trial, or upon an appropriate motion.

13 5. With respect to a motion regarding any dispute concerning this protective order which 14 |
the parties cannot informally resolve, including any disputes regarding inadvertently produced 15 |
materials under Fed. R. Evid. 502, the parties shall follow the procedures outlined in Local 16 |
Rule 251. Absent a showing of good cause, the court will not hear discovery disputes on an ex 17
|| parte basis or on shortened time.

18 6. The parties may not modify the terms of this Protective Order without the court’s 19 |
approval. If the parties agree to a potential modification, they shall submit a stipulation 20 | and
proposed order for the court’s consideration. 21 7. Pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(f), the court will
not retain jurisdiction over enforcement 22 || of the terms of this Protective Order after the action
is terminated.

23 8. Any provision in the parties’ stipulation (ECF No. 43) that is in conflict with anything 24 | in
this order is hereby DISAPPROVED. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 | DATED: April 13, 2026 Limd
27 SEAN C. RIORDAN 28 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE