

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Ryan Tan v. Nurse-Family Partnership dba Changent

Tan v. Nurse-Family Partnership · No. 25-cv-02944-DAD-CSK · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

This document is an order of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California approving a modified stipulated protective order in Ryan Tan v. Nurse-Family Partnership dba Changent, Case No. 25-cv-02944-DAD-CSK. The order, dated January 14, 2026, clarifies that the court will not retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the case is closed. The attached stipulated protective order governs the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and final disposition of confidential discovery materials.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chi Soo Kim
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-02944-DAD-CSK
DISPOSITION	approved
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties submitted a stipulated protective order for court approval in a removed employment-related civil action.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Ryan Tan v. Nurse-Family Partnership dba Changent

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- employment law

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the stipulated protective order should be approved under the applicable federal and local rules.
- Whether the court should retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the action is closed.

HOLDINGS

1. The court approved the parties' stipulated protective order because it comported with the relevant authorities and the court's Local Rule 141.1, subject to the stated clarification.
2. The court will not retain jurisdiction over the protective order once the case is closed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court APPROVES the protective order, subject to the following clarification.” (at 1)

“Thus, the Court will not retain jurisdiction over this protective order once the case is closed.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties anticipated that discovery would involve confidential personnel and employment records, proprietary business information, financial information, personally identifiable information, and sensitive internal communications. They stipulated to limitations on disclosure and use of such materials and sought a court-entered protective order to make those obligations enforceable.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties jointly stipulated to entry of a confidentiality and protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Eastern District of California Local Rule 141.1. The court approved the protective order, subject to clarification that it would not retain jurisdiction to enforce the order after the action is closed.

DISPOSITION

approved

CASES CITED

- Bylin Heating Sys., Inc. v. Thermal Techs., Inc., 2012 WL 13237584, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2012)
- Sanchez v. City of Santa Ana, 936 F.2d 1027, 1033-34 (9th Cir. 1990)