

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Eminent Consulting, LLC v. Rightsourcing, LLC

No. 2:24-cv-02646-JAM-CSK (E.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-02646-JAM-CSK · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is an order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California approving a modified stipulated protective order in Eminent Consulting, LLC v. Rightsourcing, LLC. The protective order governs confidentiality designations, disclosure and use of protected discovery material, challenges to designations, sealing procedures, inadvertent disclosure, and disposition of protected material after the litigation, with the court clarifying that it will not retain jurisdiction to enforce the order after the case is closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chi Soo Kim
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-02646-JAM-CSK
DISPOSITION	approved
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly stipulated to a modified protective order and submitted it for the court's approval.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Eminent Consulting, LLC v. Rightsourcing, LLC

TOPICS

discovery disputecivil procedurecommercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedurecommercial litigationdiscovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should approve the parties' modified stipulated protective order.

2. Whether the court would retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the action was closed.

HOLDINGS

1. The court approved the parties' modified stipulated protective order because it comported with the relevant authorities and the court's Local Rules, subject to the stated clarification concerning post-closure jurisdiction.
2. The court will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the protective order once the case is closed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the terms of any protective order filed in that action.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The litigation involved anticipated discovery of confidential, proprietary, private, and competitively sensitive information belonging to the parties and potentially nonparties. The parties represented that a private agreement would not adequately protect that information and stipulated to entry of a modified protective order governing designation, disclosure, use, filing, challenges, and disposition of protected material.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties submitted a stipulated protective order in the pending civil action. The district court reviewed and approved the order, subject to clarifying that it would not retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective 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)