

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Marie T. Wryn v. Oliphant Financial LLC

Wryn v. Oliphant Financial LLC · No. 2:24-cv-10211-JWH-E · Decided August 12, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered by the United States District Court for the Central District of California in Wryn v. Oliphant Financial, LLC, Case No. 2:24-cv-10211-JWH-E. It governs the designation, handling, disclosure, challenge, filing under seal, and ultimate return or destruction of confidential discovery materials, and was stipulated and ordered on August 12, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charles F. Eick
DECIDED	August 12, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-10211-JWH-E
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery material, and the district court approved and entered the order for good cause shown.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Marie T. Wryn v. Oliphant Financial, LLC

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- consumer protection
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery
- consumer protection
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether good cause supported entry of a stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material.

2. What restrictions and procedures should govern designation, disclosure, use, challenge, sealing, and final disposition of protected material in the action.

HOLDINGS

1. For good cause shown, the court entered the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material and limiting its use to prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the action.
2. The protective order does not itself authorize filing confidential material under seal; a party must comply with Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing sealing of the specific material.
3. A designating party must limit confidentiality designations to specific material that qualifies for protection; mass, indiscriminate, or routinized designations are prohibited and unjustified designations may result in sanctions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is a strong presumption that the public has a right of access to judicial proceedings and records in civil cases.” (at 2)

“Mass, indiscriminate, or routinized designations are prohibited.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The litigation was expected to involve trade secrets, sensitive personally identifying information, credit-reporting information, consumer data, and confidential commercial, financial, technical, and proprietary information. The parties sought an order limiting use and disclosure of such material to prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the action. The order also addressed procedures for challenging confidentiality designations, filing material under seal, handling inadvertent production of privileged material, and returning or destroying protected material after final disposition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Central District of California. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order addressing designation, disclosure, use, sealing, challenges, and disposition of confidential discovery materials. Magistrate Judge Charles F. Eick entered the order on August 12, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)
- *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. General Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002)
- *Makar-Welbon v. Sony Electronics, Inc.*, 187 F.R.D. 576, 577 (E.D. Wis. 1999)
- *Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Association*, 605 F.3d 665, 677-79 (9th Cir. 2010)

