

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Fadi Khamasmeih v. Porsche Cars North America, Inc.

No. 2:25-cv-02922-AJR, United States District Court for the Central District of California (July 8, 2025)

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered in a federal civil action concerning the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, and disposition of confidential discovery material. The order also addresses inadvertent production, unauthorized disclosure, filing under seal, and sanctions for violations.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	A. Joel Richlin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 8, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02922-AJR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery materials, and the court considered and granted the stipulated request.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the good-cause standard for protecting qualifying discovery materials under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential case-specific discovery order
PARTIES	Fadi Khamasmeih v. Porsche Cars North America, Inc.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) to enter the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery materials.
2. What procedures should govern designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing under seal, and final disposition of protected material in the action.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause existed to grant and enter the parties' stipulated protective order.
2. The protective order does not itself authorize filing protected material under seal; a party must comply with Central District of California Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing the sealing of specific material.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Having considered the forgoing, the Court finds good cause to GRANT the parties' Stipulated Protective Order.”

“This Stipulated Protective Order does not entitle them to file confidential information under seal; Civil Local Rule 79-5 sets forth the procedures that must be followed and the standards that will be applied when a party seeks permission from the court to file material under seal.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties anticipated discovery involving trade secrets, personal customer information, employee information, proprietary business and financial information, and other confidential or potentially privileged material. They requested procedures governing designation, use, disclosure, challenges, sealing, and final disposition of protected discovery material.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was filed on February 18, 2025. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order on July 7 and July 8, 2025, and the court entered it after finding good cause.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)