

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Adam Cardenas, Francisco Gonzales, and Emmanuel Villagra v. City  
of Alhambra, Sergeant Vega, Officer Yau, and Doe Officers 1-10

Cardenas v. City of Alhambra · No. 2:25-cv-05348-FMO-AJR · Decided September 11, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order proposed and entered in a federal civil rights action against the City of Alhambra and individual officers. It governs the designation, disclosure, use, challenge, filing, and final disposition of confidential discovery materials, including body-worn-camera recordings, personnel records, and administrative materials. The order was signed by counsel on September 10, 2025, and ordered by the court on September 11, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                         |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Central District of California                                                                                     |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | A. Joel Richlin                                                                                                                                         |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Central District of California                                                                                     |
| DECIDED               | September 11, 2025                                                                                                                                      |
| DOCKET                | 2:25-cv-05348-FMO-AJR                                                                                                                                   |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                   |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery materials, and the court entered the order for good cause shown. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | nonprecedential                                                                                                                                         |
| PARTIES               | Adam Cardenas, Francisco Gonzales, Emmanuel Villagra v. City of Alhambra, Sergeant Vega, Officer Yau, Doe Officers 1-10                                 |

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- civil rights
- police misconduct
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- discovery

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed to enter the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery materials.
2. What procedures should govern the designation, use, challenge, disclosure, sealing, and final disposition of confidential discovery materials.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“This Stipulated Protective 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.” (1)*

*“Once a case proceeds to trial, all of the court-filed information to be introduced that was previously designated as confidential or maintained pursuant to this protective order becomes public and will be presumptively available to all members of the public, including the press, unless compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings to proceed otherwise are made to the trial judge in advance of the trial.” (4-5)*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The discovery in the action is expected to include confidential or private information maintained by the City of Alhambra, including officer body-worn-video recordings, audio recordings, personnel records, and administrative materials. The defendants asserted that the materials warranted protection under California and federal law and that disclosure could cause harm to officers and affect the fairness of trial proceedings. The parties sought procedures governing designation, use, challenge, filing under seal, and final disposition of protected materials.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs brought a federal civil-rights action against the City of Alhambra and individual officers. The parties submitted a proposed stipulated protective order concerning body-worn-camera and audio recordings, personnel records, and other confidential administrative materials. United States Magistrate Judge A. Joel Richlin entered the order on September 11, 2025.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- 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 and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)

