

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential interlocutory protective order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

- Whether the court should approve and incorporate the parties’ stipulated protective order.
- What procedures and standards govern requests to seal documents covered by the protective order.
- 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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2026/sacramento-county-employees-retirement-system-v-telus-32cgc534>