

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Eunice Youmans v. Chelan-Douglas Land Trust; Doe(s) 1-100
employees of Chelan-Douglas Land Trust; and Corporation(s) XYZ
1-100

Youmans · No. 2:25-CV-00290-RLP · Decided April 7, 2026

SUMMARY

This document is an order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington adopting the parties’ stipulated protective order in Eunice Youmans v. Chelan-Douglas Land Trust, et al. It governs the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and return or destruction of confidential discovery materials, including medical, financial, personnel, and membership information.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rebecca L. Pennell
DECIDED	April 7, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-00290-RLP
DISPOSITION	approved
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties submitted a stipulated protective order and jointly requested that the court enter it to govern confidential discovery materials.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A party seeking a protective order must establish good cause arising from public disclosure; after that threshold showing, the court balances public and private interests and considers less restrictive alternatives such as redaction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court stipulated protective-order decision.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- privilege
- attorney client privilege

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties established good cause for a stipulated protective order covering specified medical, financial, personnel, and membership-list information.
2. Whether the proposed protective order appropriately limited confidentiality protections to material entitled to protection and preserved the requirement of court approval before filing material under seal.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties established good cause for protecting the specified categories of confidential discovery materials, and the court adopted the stipulated protective order.
2. After a threshold showing of good cause, the court must balance public and private interests and determine whether less restrictive alternatives, such as redaction, can ameliorate the asserted harm.
3. The protective order does not provide blanket protection for all disclosures and does not presumptively entitle the parties to file confidential information under seal; the party seeking continued confidentiality or sealing bears the applicable burden and must obtain court permission.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Discoverable information is “presumptively public.”” (at 2)

“If the Court finds a party has satisfied this initial burden, the Court must balance the public and private interests and determine whether less restrictive alternatives, such as redaction, can ameliorate concerns of harm.” (at 2)

“The parties’ Stipulated Protective Order, ECF No. 25, is therefore ADOPTED as set forth below.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties anticipated discovery involving Plaintiff's medical records and bills, bank-account and other financial information, tax records, personnel files of former executive directors and nonparty employee performance or discipline files, and membership-list contact information. They jointly proposed a protective order restricting disclosure and use of qualifying confidential materials while preserving public access to nonconfidential information and requiring separate court approval for sealing filings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties presented a stipulated protective order to the district court for approval. The court determined that the proposed order satisfied the good-cause threshold for protecting specified medical, financial, personnel, and membership-list information, adopted the order, and directed the clerk to file it and provide copies to counsel.

DISPOSITION

approved

CASES CITED

- Fierro Cordero v. Stemilt AG Services LLC, 142 F.4th 1201, 1207 (9th Cir. 2025)
- San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. U.S. District Court for the Northern District, 187 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir. 1999)
- In re Roman Catholic Archbishop of Portland, 661 F.3d 417, 425, 428 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1186 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Yellowcake, Inc. v. Dashgo, Inc., 2022 WL 3226824, at *10 (E.D. Cal. July 21, 2022)
- Snedigar v. Hoddersen, 114 Wash. 2d 153, 159, 786 P.2d 781, 783 (1990)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-was/2026/eunice-youmans-v-chelan-douglas-land-trust-doe-s-1-100-88b9fw10>