

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

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 21 or Rules, e.g., such as by allowing the parties to bypass the
Court's informal discovery-dispute- 22 resolution process, the Court's established practices or
Rules will govern. (See ECF No. 9, at 7-8 23 (noting procedures regarding informal discovery
conferences and discovery motions); the Court's 24 Standard Procedures (same), available on the
Court's website). 25 \\\ 26 \\\ 27 \\\ 28 \\\ 1 Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that the parties' proposed
stipulated protective order (ECF 2 | No. 15) is GRANTED. 3 4 ; IT IS SO ORDERED. 6 Dated: _
September 3, 2025 [sl heey

7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28