

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

**Joshua David Packard v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc., Longs Drug Stores
California, LLC, and Does 1 to 100, Inclusive**

Packard v. CVS Pharmacy · No. 2:24-cv-02286-DJC-CKD · Decided February 28, 2025

SUMMARY

The document is an order of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California approving the parties' stipulated protective order with modifications. The court clarifies that it will not retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the case closes and explains that confidential filing under seal remains subject to Local Rule 141.

OPINION

1 BbsRchEoTeTl@ SlCjdHfaO.cEoLm, STATE BAR NO. 224212 2 ARASH AALEM, STATE
BAR NO. 350739 aaalem@ljdfa.com 3 LA FOLLETTE, JOHNSON, DeHAAS, FESLER &
AMES 4 655 University Avenue, Suite 119 Sacramento, California 95825-6746 5 Telephone (916)
563-3100 • Facsimile (916) 565-3704 6 Attorneys for Defendant CVS PHARMACY, INC., and
LONGS DRUG STORES 7 CALIFORNIA, LLC 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA- SACRAMENTO DIVISION 10 11 JOSHUA DAVID
PACKARD, CASE NO.: 2:24-cv-02286-DJC-CKD [Removal from Superior Court of California,
12 Plaintiff, Nevada, Case No. CU0001431] 13 vs. [PROPOSED ORDER] 14 CVS PHARMACY,
INC., LONGS STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER DRUG STORES CALIFORNIA, LLC, 15
and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive, WITH MODIFICATIONS BY THE COURT 16 Defendants.

TRIAL DATE: None Set 17 ACTION FILED: 06/04/24 18 19 20 The Court has reviewed the
parties' stipulated protective order. (ECF No. 13.) The 21 stipulation comports with the relevant
authorities and the court's applicable local rule. See L.R. 22 141.1.

The Court APPROVES the protective order, subject to the following clarification. The 23 Court's
Local Rules indicate that once an action is closed, it "will not retain jurisdiction over 24
enforcement of the terms of any protective order filed in that action." L.R. 141.1(f); see also, e.g.,
25 MD Helicopters, Inc. v. Aerometals, Inc., 2017 WL 495778 (E.D. Cal., Feb.

03, 2017) (noting 26 that courts in the district generally do not retain jurisdiction for disputes
concerning protective 27 orders after closure of the case). Thus, the Court will not retain
jurisdiction over this protective 28 order once the case is closed. 1 Further, this Stipulated
Protective Order does not entitle a party to file confidential 2 || information under seal.

Local Rule 141 sets forth the procedures that must be followed and the 3 || standards that will be applied when a party seeks permission from the Court to file material under 4 || seal. If a party's request to file confidential material under seal is denied by the Court, then the 5 || party may file the information in the public record unless otherwise instructed by the Court.

6 || Dated: February 28, 2025 / aie } Kt | Ld a a CAROLYN K.DELANEY SS 8 2286.24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 9 10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 -2-