

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential interlocutory protective order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)

