

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Doe 1 v. Winters Joint Unified School District

Doe 1 · No. 2:25-cv-00608-DC-CSK · Decided June 23, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is an order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California approving the parties’ stipulated protective order in Doe 1 v. Winters Joint Unified School District. The order clarifies that the court will not retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the action is closed, notwithstanding the stipulated order’s contrary provision.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Chi Soo Kim
DECIDED	June 23, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00608-DC-CSK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court reviewed a stipulated protective order submitted by the parties and entered an order approving it subject to a clarification concerning post-closure jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- discovery dispute civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure discovery confidentiality and protective orders

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the stipulated protective order should be approved.
- Whether the court would retain jurisdiction to enforce the protective order after the underlying action is closed.

HOLDINGS

1. The court approved the parties' stipulated protective order because it complied with the relevant authorities and the court's Local Rule, subject to the court's clarification regarding post-closure jurisdiction.
2. The court will not retain jurisdiction over enforcement of the protective order once the case is closed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court APPROVES the protective order, subject to the following clarification.” (at 2)

“Thus, the Court will not retain jurisdiction over this protective order once the case is closed.” (at 2-3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties stipulated to a protective order because discovery was expected to involve sensitive, confidential, private, and protected records. The stipulated order governed the treatment, disclosure, filing, and final disposition of protected discovery material. The court reviewed the submitted order for compliance with relevant authorities and the court's Local Rule 141.1.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties initially attached the stipulated protective order to a joint status report filed at ECF No. 9. At the court's request, Plaintiff Jane Doe 1 refiled the protective order separately at ECF No. 10. The court reviewed and approved the stipulated order, subject to clarification that it would not retain jurisdiction to enforce the order after the action is closed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Bylin Heating Sys., Inc. v. Thermal Techs., Inc., 2012 WL 13237584, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2012)