

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Bolton v. Solar Mosaic, LLC

Bolton · No. 2:24-cv-2848 TLN AC · Decided July 25, 2025

SUMMARY

This is an order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California approving and incorporating the parties’ stipulated protective order. It governs sealing requests, confidentiality designations, discovery disputes, modifications, enforcement jurisdiction, and conflicts between the stipulation and the court’s order. The order was issued by Magistrate Judge Allison Claire on July 25, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison Claire
DECIDED	July 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-2848 TLN AC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered the parties' stipulated protective order and entered an order approving and incorporating it into the case.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential interlocutory protective order

TOPICS

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

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Discovery
- Sealing of court records
- Evidence and privilege

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the parties' stipulated protective order should be approved and incorporated into the court's order.
- What procedures and standards govern requests to seal documents, disputes concerning the protective order, modifications, and post-termination enforcement.

HOLDINGS

1. The court approved and incorporated the parties' stipulated protective order, except that any provision conflicting with the court's order was disapproved.
2. Designation of a document as confidential under the protective order does not automatically authorize filing it under seal; a written sealing order must be obtained under E.D. Cal. Local Rule 141.
3. A request to seal material normally must satisfy the compelling-reasons standard, but material tangentially related to the merits may be sealed upon a showing of good cause.
4. For unresolved disputes concerning the protective order, including disputes concerning inadvertently produced materials under Federal Rule of Evidence 502, the parties must follow E.D. Cal. Local Rule 251; absent good cause, discovery disputes will not be heard ex parte or on shortened time.
5. The court will not retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the action is terminated.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The designation of documents (including transcripts of testimony) as confidential pursuant to this order does not automatically entitle the parties to file such a document with the court under seal.” (at 1)

“A request to seal material must normally meet the high threshold of showing that “compelling reasons” support secrecy; however, where the material is, at most, “tangentially related” to the merits of a case, the request to seal may be granted on a showing of “good cause.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties entered into a stipulated protective order concerning confidential documents and discovery materials. The court reviewed the stipulation and approved it subject to the requirements and limitations stated in the order, including the Eastern District of California's rules governing sealed filings and discovery disputes.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties submitted a stipulated protective order, identified as ECF No. 47, for court approval. The court approved and incorporated the stipulation, disapproved any conflicting provision, and set procedures governing sealing requests, protective-order disputes, modifications, and enforcement.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-1102 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 137 S. Ct. 38 (2016)
- Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-80 (9th Cir. 2006)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 WANDERLYN BOLTON, an individual, No. 2:24-cv-2848 TLN AC 12
Plaintiff, 13 v. PROTECTIVE ORDER 14 SOLAR MOSAIC, LLC; EXPERIAN INFORMATION
SOLUTIONS, INC., 15 EQUIFAX INFORMATION SERVICES, LLC; TRANSUNION, LLC;
and DOES 1 16 to 50, inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 19 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the
parties' Stipulated Protective Order (ECF No. 47), is 20 APPROVED and INCORPORATED
herein.

21 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT: 22 1. Requests to seal documents shall be made by
motion before the same judge who will 23 decide the matter related to that request to seal. 24 2.
The designation of documents (including transcripts of testimony) as confidential 25 pursuant to
this order does not automatically entitle the parties to file such a document with the 26 court under
seal.

Parties are advised that any request to seal documents in this district is governed 27 by E.D. Cal.
R. ("Local Rule") 141. In brief, Local Rule 141 provides that documents may only 28 be sealed by
a written order of the court after a specific request to seal has been made. Local 1 Rule 141(a).

However, a mere request to seal is not enough under the local rules. In particular, 2 Local Rule
141(b) requires that "[t]he 'Request to Seal Documents' shall set forth the statutory or 3 other
authority for sealing, the requested duration, the identity, by name or category, of persons 4 to be
permitted access to the document, and all relevant information." Local Rule 141(b) 5 (emphasis
added).

6 3. A request to seal material must normally meet the high threshold of showing that 7
"compelling reasons" support secrecy; however, where the material is, at most, "tangentially 8
related" to the merits of a case, the request to seal may be granted on a showing of "good cause." 9
Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-1102 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 10
137 S. Ct.

38 (2016); Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-80 (9th 11 Cir. 2006).
12 4. Nothing in this order shall limit the testimony of parties or non-parties, or the use of 13
certain documents, at any court hearing or trial – such determinations will only be made by the 14
court at the hearing or trial, or upon an appropriate motion. 15 5.

With respect to motions regarding any disputes concerning this protective order which 16 the
parties cannot informally resolve, including any disputes regarding inadvertently produced 17
materials under Fed. R. Evid. 502, the parties shall follow the procedures outlined in Local 18
Rule 251. Absent a showing of good cause, the court will not hear discovery disputes on an ex 19
parte basis or on shortened time.

20 6. The parties may not modify the terms of this Protective Order without the court's 21
approval. If the parties agree to a potential modification, they shall submit a stipulation 22 and
proposed order for the court's consideration. 23 7. Pursuant to Local Rule 141.1(f), the court will
not retain jurisdiction over enforcement 24 of the terms of this Protective Order after the action is
terminated.

25 //// 26 //// 27 //// 28 //// 1 8. Any provision in the parties' stipulation (ECF No. 47) that is in
conflict with anything 2 || 1n this order is hereby DISAPPROVED. 3 IT IS SO ORDERED. 4 |
DATED: July 25, 2025. ~ ° Httven— Lhar—e_ 6 ALLISON CLAIRE UNITED STATES
MAGISTRATE JUDGE 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28