

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Estate of Jeremiah Wright, et al. v. County of Stanislaus, et al.

No. 2:24-cv-2505 WBS AC, United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (January 13,
2026)

OPINION

Estate of Jeremiah Wright, et al. v. County of Stanislaus, et al.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 ESTATE OF JEREMIAH WRIGHT, et al., No. 2:24-cv-2505 WBS AC 12 Plaintiff,

13 v. PROTECTIVE ORDER

14 COUNTY OF STANISLAUS, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the
parties' Stipulated Protective Order (ECF No. 34), is 18 APPROVED and INCORPORATED
herein. 19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT: 20 1. Requests to seal documents shall be made
by motion before the same judge who will 21 decide the matter related to that request to seal. 22
2. The designation of documents (including transcripts of testimony) as confidential 23 pursuant
to this order does not automatically entitle the parties to file such a document with the 24 court
under seal. Parties are advised that any request to seal documents in this district is governed 25 by
E.D. Cal. R. ("Local Rule") 141. In brief, Local Rule 141 provides that documents may only 26 be
sealed by a written order of the court after a specific request to seal has been made. Local
27 Rule 141(a). However, a mere request to seal is not enough under the local rules. In particular,
28 Local Rule 141(b) requires that "[t]he 'Request to Seal Documents' shall set forth the statutory
or 1 || other authority for sealing, the requested duration, the identity, by name or category, of
persons 2 || to be permitted access to the document, and all relevant information." Local Rule
141(b) 3 || (emphasis added). 4 3. A request to seal material must normally meet the high threshold
of showing that 5 || "compelling reasons" support secrecy; however, where the material is, at most,
"tangentially 6 || related" to the merits of a case, the request to seal may be granted on a showing
of "good cause." 7 | Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-1102 (9th
Cir.), cert. denied, 8 | 1378S. Ct. 38 (2016); Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d
1172, 1178-80 (9th 9 || Cir. 2006). 10 4. Nothing in this order shall limit the testimony of parties or
non-parties, or the use of 11 | certain documents, at any court hearing or trial — such
determinations will only be made by the 12 || court at the hearing or trial, or upon an appropriate
motion. 13 5. With respect to motions regarding any disputes concerning this protective order
which 14 | the parties cannot informally resolve, including any disputes regarding inadvertently

produced 15 || materials under Fed. R. Evid. 502, the parties shall follow the procedures outlined in Local 16 || Rule 251. Absent a showing of good cause, the court will not hear discovery disputes on an ex 17 || parte basis or on shortened time. 18 6. The parties may not modify the terms of this Protective Order without the court's 19 || approval. If the parties agree to a potential modification, they shall submit a stipulation 20 || and proposed order for the court's consideration. 21 7. Pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(f), the court will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement 22 | of the terms of this Protective Order after the action is terminated. 23 8. Any provision in the parties' stipulation (ECF No. 34) that is in conflict with anything 24 || in this order is hereby DISAPPROVED. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 || DATED: January 13, 2026 Z 2 fa (|

27 ALLISON CLAIRE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE