

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Anthony Eidem v. Vang, et al.

Eidem v. Vang · No. 1:23-cv-01198 JLT BAM · Decided April 23, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order in Anthony Eidem v. C. Vang, a federal civil action in the Eastern District of California. It governs the designation, handling, disclosure, challenge, filing, and final disposition of confidential and attorneys’-eyes-only discovery material, particularly information concerning California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation operations and investigations. The court adopted the stipulated order for good cause under Document 48.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Barbara A. McAuliffe
DECIDED	April 23, 2025
DOCKET	1:23-cv-01198 JLT BAM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential and attorneys'-eyes-only discovery material, and the magistrate judge adopted the stipulated order after finding good cause.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court found good cause to adopt the stipulated protective order. For future sealing requests, the order states that good cause applies to documents attached to nondispositive motions and compelling reasons apply to documents attached to dispositive motions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential case-specific discovery order
PARTIES	Anthony Eidem v. Vang, et al.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights
- discovery and protective orders

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported adoption of the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential and attorneys'-eyes-only discovery material.
2. What standards and procedures govern any later request to file material subject to the protective order under seal.

HOLDINGS

1. The court adopted the parties' stipulated protective order upon finding good cause.
2. A protective order does not itself authorize filing documents under seal; a party must comply with Eastern District of California Local Rule 141 and make the showing required for the type of motion to which the documents are attached.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Having considered the parties’ stipulated protective order, and finding good cause, the Court adopts the stipulated protective order (Doc. 48).” (at 15-17)

“The party making a request to file documents under seal shall be required to show good cause for documents attached to a non-dispositive motion or compelling reasons for documents attached to a dispositive motion.” (at 15-17)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action is likely to involve confidential information concerning the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, including confidential informants, internal-affairs investigations, use-of-force investigations, grievance investigations, inmate-misconduct investigations, and prison security procedures. The plaintiff is incarcerated in CDCR custody, creating stated safety and security concerns regarding disclosure of certain information. The parties sought a protective order to facilitate discovery while limiting disclosure and use of protected material.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

This prisoner civil-rights action was pending in the Eastern District of California. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order on April 22, 2025. On April 23, 2025, the court adopted the order and provided additional instructions concerning motions to seal and informal discovery-dispute procedures.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass'n*, 605 F.3d 665, 677-78 (9th Cir. 2010)

