

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Contractor Management Services LLC v. Para Incorporated, et al.

No. CV-25-01645-PHX-DWL (D. Ariz. Feb. 27, 2026) · No. CV-25-01645-PHX-DWL · Decided February 27, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona addresses the parties’ joint motion for entry of a protective order. The court grants the motion in part and denies it in part, rejecting proposed provisions that would place the burden on the challenging party to disprove a confidentiality designation and would apply a “compelling reasons” standard to requests for access to confidential materials.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	February 27, 2026
DOCKET	CV-25-01645-PHX-DWL
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly moved for entry of a protective order. The court considered their proposed deviations from the court's model protective order and granted the motion in part and denied it in part.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not indicated
PARTIES	Contractor Management Services LLC v. Para Incorporated, et al.

TOPICS

[discovery dispute](#) [civil procedure](#) [commercial litigation](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[civil procedure](#) [commercial litigation](#) [trade secrets](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties could stipulate in a protective order that the party challenging a confidentiality designation would bear the burden of demonstrating that the designation was improper.

2. Whether the parties could adopt a compelling-reasons standard for motions seeking permission to disclose confidential materials to individuals not otherwise authorized to view them.

HOLDINGS

1. The court declined to add a provision placing the burden on the party challenging a confidentiality designation because the designating party must justify each designation by demonstrating good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c), notwithstanding contrary language in a stipulated protective order.
2. The court declined to add a provision requiring a party seeking permission to disclose confidential materials to show compelling reasons because the compelling-reasons standard is a term of art governing whether the standard for sealing has been met and does not map neatly onto disputes over disclosure of confidential information to a particular party.

KEY QUOTATIONS

““Compelling reasons” is a term of art in this context governing whether the substantive standard for sealing has been met.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties jointly sought entry of a protective order governing confidentiality designations and disclosure of confidential materials. They proposed adding language placing the burden on the party challenging a confidentiality designation. They also proposed requiring a party seeking access to confidential materials to show compelling reasons.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona when the parties jointly submitted a proposed protective order. The court rejected two proposed provisions and directed that a modified protective order would issue separately.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Penn Eng'g & Mfg. Corp. v. Peninsula Components, Inc., 2021 WL 4192038, *2 (E.D. Pa. 2021)
- Biogen Int'l GmbH v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 2019 WL 13562242, *3 (N.D. W. Va. 2019)
- Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006)