

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Aimee Allison v. Terri J. Vaughn, Tyler Vision LLC, Netflix, Inc.,
Nina Holiday Entertainment, Inc. and Does 1-25

Allison v. Vaughn · No. 2:25-cv-04476-RGK-JPR · Decided October 14, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a Stipulated Protective Order in Aimee Allison v. Terri J. Vaughn, Tyler Vision LLC, Netflix, Inc., Nina Holiday Entertainment, Inc., and Does 1-25, pending in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. It establishes procedures for designating, accessing, challenging, filing, and handling confidential and highly confidential discovery materials through final disposition of the action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jean P. Rosenbluth
DECIDED	October 14, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-04476-RGK-JPR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery material, and the district court entered the order for good cause shown.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The order states that good cause is required for sealing material related to non-dispositive motions and that compelling reasons, supported by specific facts and legal justification, are required for material related to dispositive motions or trial.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported entry of a stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery materials.
2. What procedures and standards govern designation, disclosure, challenge, use, sealing, and return or destruction of protected discovery material.
3. Whether material designated as confidential becomes subject to automatic sealing or remains governed by the applicable sealing standards and local rules.

HOLDINGS

1. The court approved and entered the stipulated protective order because discovery was likely to involve confidential, proprietary, private, and commercially sensitive information warranting protection from public disclosure and use outside the litigation.
2. Designation of material as confidential under the protective order does not authorize filing that material under seal; a party must comply with Central District of California Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing sealing of the specific material.
3. A party or non-party may challenge a confidentiality designation, but the designating party bears the burden of persuasion, and the challenged material remains protected at the designated level until the court rules on the challenge.
4. Within 60 days after a written request following final disposition, each receiving party must return or destroy protected material and certify that it has done so, subject to the order's archival-copy exception for counsel.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The parties’ mere designation of Disclosure or Discovery Material as CONFIDENTIAL or HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – ATTORNEYS’ EYES ONLY 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.” (2)

“Protected Material may only be filed under seal pursuant to a court order authorizing the sealing of the specific Protected Material at issue.” (12)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Discovery in the action was expected to involve confidential, proprietary, private, commercial, financial, technical, and research information. The parties identified potential trade secrets, subscriber and pricing lists, business practices, and information implicating third-party privacy rights. They sought a protective order to regulate designation, disclosure, challenge, use, sealing, and disposition of such material.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff Aimee Allison brought a federal trademark-infringement action against Terri J. Vaughn, Tyler Vision LLC, Netflix, Inc., Nina Holiday Entertainment, Inc., and Does 1-25. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order concerning confidential and highly confidential discovery materials. On October 14, 2025, the court approved and entered the stipulated order.

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 Ass'n, 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/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california/2025/aimee-allison-v-terri-j-vaughn-tyler-vision-llc-netflix-inc-7xdchbkw>