

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, EASTERN DIVISION

Guillermina Ibarra Soto v. Nissan North America, Inc., et al.

Ibarra Soto v. Nissan North America · No. 5:25-cv-00981-SSS-DTB · Decided December 23, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order approved by the United States District Court for the Central District of California in Guillermina Ibarra Soto v. Nissan North America, Inc. It governs the designation, use, disclosure, filing, challenge, and final disposition of confidential discovery materials, including proprietary business information and consumer records.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California, Eastern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	David T. Bristow
DECIDED	December 23, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-00981-SSS-DTB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery materials, and the court approved and entered the order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential case-specific order

TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure consumer protection

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure discovery consumer protection

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported entry of the parties' stipulated protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Local Rule 141.1.
2. What procedures should govern designation, use, challenge, sealing, and final disposition of confidential discovery materials.

HOLDINGS

1. Upon a showing of good cause, the court approved and entered the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery materials.
2. A confidentiality designation alone does not authorize filing material under seal; the filing party must comply with Local Civil Rule 79-5 and make the required evidentiary showing, with redaction used when feasible.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is a strong presumption that the public has a right of access to judicial proceedings and records in civil cases.” (section 3)

“Accordingly, the terms of this protective order do not extend beyond the commencement of the trial.” (section 6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought information concerning Nissan's internal lemon-law policies and procedures, consumer information, and consumer complaints. The parties anticipated discovery involving trade secrets, proprietary business, financial, technical, commercial, and potentially private information. They stipulated to procedures limiting use and disclosure of qualifying materials and governing challenges to confidentiality designations and requests to file materials under seal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff brought an action against Nissan North America, Inc. involving alleged lemon-law-related matters. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order concerning confidential discovery materials, and Magistrate Judge David T. Bristow approved it on December 23, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Makar-Welbon v. Sony Electronics, Inc., 187 F.R.D. 576, 577 (E.D. Wis. 1999)
- Pintos v. Pac. Creditors Ass'n, 605 F.3d 665, 677-79 (9th Cir. 2010)