

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Dwyon Grant v. County of Riverside; Deputy McQueeney; and Doe
Deputies 1–10

Grant v. County of Riverside · No. 5:25-cv-02558-SSS (Ex) · Decided December 23, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered in Dwyon Grant v. County of Riverside, Deputy McQueeney, and Doe Deputies 1–10. It governs the designation, handling, disclosure, challenge, filing, and final disposition of confidential discovery materials in the action, and was stipulated to by counsel and ordered by the United States District Court for the Central District of California on December 23, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charles F. Eick
DECIDED	December 23, 2025
DOCKET	5:25-cv-02558-SSS (Ex)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery materials, and the court entered the order for good cause shown.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Dwyon Grant v. County of Riverside, Deputy McQueeney, Doe Deputies 1–10

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- sanctions
- civil rights
- section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed to enter a stipulated protective order governing the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, retention, and disposition of confidential discovery materials.
2. What procedures and protections should govern confidential discovery materials in the action.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause existed to enter the parties' stipulated protective order because discovery was likely to involve confidential, proprietary, private, and otherwise sensitive information.
2. Material properly designated as confidential may be used only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the action and may be disclosed only to persons authorized by the order.
3. A party or nonparty may challenge a confidentiality designation through the applicable meet-and-confer and local-rule process, and the designating party bears the burden of persuasion while the challenge is pending.
4. The protective order does not itself authorize filing confidential material under seal; a party must comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing the sealing of specific material.
5. After final disposition, and within 60 days of a written request by the designating party, receiving parties must return or destroy protected material and provide written certification, subject to the order's archival-copy exception.

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.” (§ 12.3)

“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.” (§ 7.1)

“After the final disposition of this Action, as defined in paragraph 4, within 60 days of a written request by the Designating Party, each Receiving Party must return all Protected Material to the Producing Party or destroy such material.” (§ 13)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action is expected to involve discovery of confidential or private information, including employment and personnel records concerning individually named defendants and County employees. Defendants also anticipated discovery concerning Plaintiff's mental-health history, potential criminal history, and law-enforcement interactions. Based on the parties' representations and the need to facilitate discovery while protecting legitimately confidential information, the court found that a protective order was justified.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed this civil-rights action on September 16, 2025. The parties represented that discovery would involve confidential personnel, mental-health, criminal-history, and law-enforcement information and jointly

submitted a stipulated protective order. Magistrate Judge Charles F. Eick approved and entered the order on December 23, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kamakana v. City & 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/dwyon-grant-v-county-of-riverside-deputy-mcqueeney-and-doe-ixr01hp4>