

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Castillo v. Starbucks Corporation

Castillo · No. 1:24-cv-01570-KES-EPG · Decided September 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants the parties’ proposed confidentiality stipulation and protective order in Castillo v. Starbucks Corporation. The Court explains that the order cannot bind the Court or its personnel and that the Court’s established practices and rules govern any conflict, including procedures for resolving discovery disputes.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 3, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-01570-KES-EPG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered the parties' proposed confidentiality stipulation and protective order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should grant the parties' proposed confidentiality stipulation and protective order.
- Whether a stipulated protective order may override the court's established practices and rules or bind the court and its personnel.

HOLDINGS

- The court granted the parties' proposed stipulated confidentiality and protective order.

2. A protective order may not bind the court or its personnel, and any provision conflicting with the court's established practices or rules—including procedures for resolving discovery disputes—is subordinate to those practices and rules.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“a protective order may not bind the Court or its personnel.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties jointly proposed a confidentiality stipulation and protective order in this civil action. The proposed order apparently addressed discovery-related procedures, including the handling of confidential information and potentially the informal resolution of discovery disputes. The court approved the proposed order but clarified that it could not bind the court or its personnel and could not override established court practices or rules.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties submitted a proposed stipulated confidentiality and protective order under ECF No. 15. The district court reviewed and granted the stipulation, subject to the court's established practices and rules.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Rangel v. Forest River, Inc., No. EDCV 17-0613 JFW (SS), 2017 WL 2825922, at *2 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2017)

OPINION

Castillo v. Starbucks Corporation

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 DONALD CASTILLO, Case No. 1:24-cv-01570-KES-EPG 11 Plaintiff,

12 v. ORDER GRANTING PROPOSED

CONFIDENTIALITY STIPULATION AND

13 STARBUCKS CORPORATION, PROTECTIVE ORDER

14 Defendant. (ECF No. 15) 15 16 This matter is before the Court on the parties’ proposed
confidentiality stipulation and 17 protective order. (ECF No. 15). Upon review, the Court will
grant the stipulation. 18 The Court notes that “a protective order may not bind the Court or its
personnel.” Rangel 19 v. Forest River, Inc., No. EDCV 17-0613 JFW (SS), 2017 WL 2825922, at

*2 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2017). Thus, to the extent that the protective order conflicts with the Court's established practices or Rules, e.g., such as by allowing the parties to bypass the Court's informal discovery-dispute-resolution process, the Court's established practices or Rules will govern. (See ECF No. 9, at 7-8 (noting procedures regarding informal discovery conferences and discovery motions); the Court's Standard Procedures (same), available on the Court's website). Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that the parties' proposed stipulated protective order (ECF No. 15) is GRANTED. ; IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: September 3, 2025 [sl heey
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28