

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
CALIFORNIA

Faubel v. Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC

Faubel · No. 1:25-cv-00313-KES-EPG · Decided May 13, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California partially granted Defendant’s motion for entry of a protective order. The court limited the definition of confidential information to specified categories, including trade secrets, confidential personal, financial, business, and competitive information, and clarified that the protective order could not override the court’s rules or established procedures.

CASE DETAILS

|                    |                                                                                                                                                                        |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT              | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                                    |
| JURISDICTION       | United States District Court for the Eastern District of California                                                                                                    |
| DECIDED            | May 13, 2025                                                                                                                                                           |
| DOCKET             | 1:25-cv-00313-KES-EPG                                                                                                                                                  |
| DISPOSITION        | other                                                                                                                                                                  |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE | Defendant moved for entry of a protective order, representing that the parties had agreed to it. The court granted the motion in part and modified the proposed order. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE | unpublished                                                                                                                                                            |

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the proposed protective order adequately described the types of information eligible for confidential treatment under Local Rule 141(c)(1).
- Whether a protective order may bind the court or permit the parties to bypass the court's established practices and rules.

## HOLDINGS

1. A protective order may not define confidential information solely by reference to information that the parties believe qualifies for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c); the order must describe in general terms the types of information eligible for protection. The court therefore limited the definition to the categories identified in the motion.
2. A protective order does not bind the court or court personnel, and the court's established practices and rules govern if the protective order conflicts with them.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child).” (1)*

*“a protective order may not bind the Court or its personnel.” (2)*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant submitted a proposed protective order that defined confidential information as information or tangible things qualifying for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). The court found that this definition did not identify the types of information subject to protection as required by Local Rule 141(c)(1), although the motion identified categories including trade secrets and confidential, personal, financial, business, and competitive information.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff brought the action individually and on behalf of others similarly situated. Defendant sought a protective order during the litigation, and the district court reviewed and partially approved the proposed order.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Rangel v. Forest River, Inc., No. EDCV 17-0613 JFW (SS), 2017 WL 2825922, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2017)