

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

United Auto Credit Corporation v. Jessica Stewart; Julian Hicks;
Veros Credit LLC; and Does 1-25

No. 8:25-cv-65 RGK (ADSx) (C.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2025) · No. 8:25-cv-65 RGK (ADSx) · Decided August 29,
2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered in United Auto Credit Corporation v. Jessica Stewart et al., a federal civil action in the Central District of California. It governs the designation, disclosure, use, challenge, filing, and disposition of confidential and highly confidential discovery materials.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Autumn D. Spaeth
DECIDED	August 29, 2025
DOCKET	8:25-cv-65 RGK (ADSx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery material, and the magistrate judge entered the order for good cause shown.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure commercial litigation commercial

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure commercial litigation consumer protection

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether good cause supported entry of a stipulated protective order governing confidential and highly confidential discovery material.

2. What restrictions and procedures should govern designation, disclosure, use, challenge, inadvertent production, sealing, and disposition of protected material.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause supported entry of the parties' stipulated protective order to protect qualifying confidential and proprietary discovery material.
2. Material designated under the order may be used only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the action and may be disclosed only to authorized recipients under the specified conditions.
3. The protective order does not itself authorize filing protected material under seal; a party seeking sealing must comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing sealing of the specific material.
4. A party or nonparty may challenge a confidentiality designation, but the designating party bears the burden of persuasion and the material remains protected under the designation until the court rules on the challenge.
5. Inadvertent production of privileged or work-product-protected material does not waive the privilege or protection in this action or any other federal or state proceeding, subject to the procedures governing asserted privilege.

KEY QUOTATIONS

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

“A Receiving Party may use Protected Material that is disclosed or produced by another Party or by a Non-Party in connection with this Action only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle this Action.” (§ VIII.A.1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The litigation was expected to involve discovery of alleged trade secrets, customer and pricing lists, and confidential commercial, financial, technical, research, and development information. The parties represented that special protection was needed to prevent public disclosure and use of such information for purposes unrelated to prosecuting, defending, or settling the action. The court found good cause to enter the stipulated protective order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Central District of California and involved alleged trade-secret and other proprietary information. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order addressing designation, disclosure, use, challenges, inadvertent production, filing under seal, and treatment of protected material after final disposition. Magistrate Judge Autumn D. Spaeth ordered the stipulated protective order on August 29, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/united-auto-credit-corporation-v-jessica-stewart-julian-bth8axk0>