

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Steven Raymond, Kyong 'Gina' Raymond, and Chase Hyon v. Zach Conine, Nevada State Treasurer's Office, and Danielle Anthony

Raymond · No. 2:23-cv-01195-CDS-MDC · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a proposed joint stipulated protective order in Steven Raymond, Kyong ‘Gina’ Raymond, and Chase Hyon v. Zach Conine and others, Case No. 2:23-cv-01195-CDS-MDC, in the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada. The proposed order addresses confidentiality designations, permitted disclosures, challenges to designations, handling of confidential materials after litigation, and public access. Magistrate Judge Maximiliano D. Couvillier III denied the proposed order without prejudice on December 3, 2025, and directed the parties to submit a revised order addressing sealing requirements, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2, Ninth Circuit standards, and potentially artificial intelligence protocols.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maximiliano D. Couvillier III
DECIDED	December 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-01195-CDS-MDC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties submitted a proposed joint stipulated protective order in an ongoing federal civil action. The magistrate judge denied the proposed order without prejudice and ordered the parties to submit a revised proposed order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties' proposed joint stipulated protective order should be entered.
2. What requirements the revised protective order must address concerning the filing of confidential materials and restrictions on public access.

HOLDINGS

1. The court denied the parties' proposed protective order without prejudice because the proposal did not adequately address the requirements of Local Rule IA 10-5, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2, and the substantive standards governing motions to restrict public access to judicial records.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The parties’ proposed Protective Order at ECF No. 76 is DENIED without prejudice.” (at 4)

“IT IS ORDERED that the parties file by December 16, 2025, a revised proposed order that addresses filing documents marked confidential in accordance with LR IA 10-5 and FRCP 5.2, and the substantive standards of Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006) and its progeny.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties asserted that discovery in the litigation would involve confidential and proprietary information, including medical and personal financial information, personnel information, trade secrets, and other information protected from public disclosure. They jointly proposed a protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and District of Nevada Local Rule 26-6. The court determined that the proposed order required revision before it could be approved, particularly regarding the filing of confidential materials and the applicable substantive standards.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs and defendants jointly stipulated to a proposed protective order governing confidential discovery materials and filed it as ECF No. 76. The court denied that proposal without prejudice because it did not adequately address the requirements for filing confidential materials under the local rules, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2, and the governing public-access standards, and directed the parties to file a revised order by December 16, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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