

**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

OPINION

Bolton v. Solar Mosaic, LLC

PER CURIAM.

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