

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Everardo Alvarez Rios v. O'Reilly Auto Enterprises, LLC

Alvarez Rios · No. 2:25-cv-03063-MWC-SSC · Decided July 14, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered in Everardo Alvarez Rios v. O'Reilly Auto Enterprises, LLC, a federal employment action in the Central District of California. It governs the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing under seal, and post-litigation disposition of confidential discovery materials, including personnel, workplace-investigation, workers' compensation, health, wage, and benefits information.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stephanie S. Christensen
DECIDED	July 14, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-03063-MWC-SSC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to a protective order in an employment action and petitioned the court to enter it. The magistrate judge entered the stipulated protective order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Everardo Alvarez Rios v. O'Reilly Auto Enterprises, LLC, Stephanie S. Christensen, Does 1–50

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- employment law
- medical records privacy
- hipaa

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- employment law
- health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported entry of a stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery materials.
2. What procedures should govern designation, use, disclosure, challenge, sealing, and post-litigation disposition of protected discovery material.

HOLDINGS

1. The court found that a protective order was justified and entered the parties' stipulated protective order to govern confidential discovery materials in the action.
2. The stipulated protective order does not independently authorize filing confidential material under seal; a party must comply with Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing sealing of the specific material.
3. Protected material 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 protective order.

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)

"The parties' mere designation of Disclosure or Discovery Material as CONFIDENTIAL does not—without the submission of competent evidence by declaration, establishing that the material sought to be filed under seal qualifies as confidential, privileged, or otherwise protectable—constitute good cause." (at 2)

"Once a case proceeds to trial, information that was designated as CONFIDENTIAL or maintained pursuant to this Stipulated Protective Order and used or introduced as an exhibit at trial 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." (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

This employment action is expected to involve discovery concerning the defendant's internal policies, personnel decisions, workplace-investigation witness statements, the plaintiff's workers' compensation claims and HIPAA-protected information, and compensation information. The parties represented that some discovery materials warranted protection from public disclosure and use outside the litigation. They stipulated to procedures governing confidentiality designations, challenges, disclosure, sealing, and disposition of protected materials.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was filed in the Central District of California and involved anticipated discovery of confidential employment, personnel, workers' compensation, medical, wage, and benefits information. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order, which the court approved and ordered on July 14, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd 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 Association*, 605 F.3d 665, 677–79 (9th Cir. 2010)
- *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180–81 (9th Cir. 2006)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/everardo-alvarez-rios-v-o-reilly-auto-enterprises-llc-6owfq3p8>