

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Eric Hayde and Megan Wheeler, individually and on behalf of all
others similarly situated v. Arcadia Consumer Healthcare Inc., a
Delaware corporation**

Hayde v. Arcadia · No. 8:24-cv-02657-JDE · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

This document is a Stipulated Protective Order entered by the United States District Court for the Central District of California in Hayde v. Arcadia Consumer Healthcare Inc. It governs the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and disposition of confidential discovery materials, including privileged material and non-party information. The order was entered for good cause on January 9, 2026, by Magistrate Judge John D. Early.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John D. Early
DECIDED	January 9, 2026
DOCKET	8:24-cv-02657-JDE
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court entered a stipulated protective order governing the treatment, disclosure, use, sealing, challenge, and disposition of confidential discovery material in the pending putative class action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the good-cause standard for a discovery protective order and incorporated the applicable good-cause and compelling-reasons standards for sealing judicial records.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Eric Hayde, Megan Wheeler v. Arcadia Consumer Healthcare Inc.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- consumer protection
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported entry of a stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material.
2. What procedures should govern designation, disclosure, challenge, sealing, inadvertent production, and final disposition of protected material.
3. What showing is required to file protected material under seal in connection with non-dispositive motions, dispositive motions, or trial.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause supported entry of the parties' stipulated protective order to protect qualifying confidential, proprietary, private, commercial, financial, technical, and potentially privileged discovery material from inappropriate public disclosure or use.
2. Material designated as confidential under the order may be used only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the action and may be disclosed only to the categories of persons and under the conditions specified in the order.
3. The protective order does not itself authorize filing confidential material under seal; a party must separately comply with Central District of California Local Civil Rule 79-5 and make the showing required for the particular filing.
4. Within 30 days after final disposition of the action, each receiving party must return or destroy protected material and provide written certification, subject to the order's archival-copy exception for counsel.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is a strong presumption that the public has a right of access to judicial proceedings and records in civil cases.” (at 2-3)

“This Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery and 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.” (at 2)

“Within 30 days after the final disposition of this action, as defined in paragraph 4, each Receiving Party must return all Protected Material to the Producing Party or destroy such material.” (at 14)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The pending action is likely to involve production of trade secrets, customer and pricing lists, and other confidential commercial, financial, technical, proprietary, and potentially privileged information. The parties sought special protection against public disclosure and use of such information for purposes unrelated to prosecuting, defending, or settling the litigation. The court found good cause to enter a protective order but emphasized that confidentiality designations must be limited to material entitled to protection under applicable legal principles.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties submitted a stipulation requesting entry of a protective order. The court found good cause and ordered the stipulated protective-order terms, including procedures for confidentiality designations, challenges, sealing applications, inadvertent production, access restrictions, and return or destruction of protected material.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Phillips v. General 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. Pacific Creditors Ass'n*, 605 F.3d 665, 677-79 (9th Cir. 2010)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2026/eric-hayde-and-megan-wheeler-individually-and-on-behalf-of-6g38i9fk>