

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

James Robertson and Karyn A. Robertson v. IQ Data International,
Inc.; Equifax Information Services, LLC; Experian Information
Solutions, Inc.; Trans Union, LLC; and Does 1-10, inclusive

Robertson · No. 2:25-cv-0759-TLN-JDP · Decided October 9, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order governing the designation, use, disclosure, and disposition of confidential discovery materials in James Robertson and Karyn A. Robertson v. IQ Data International, Inc., et al. The action is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California, Sacramento Division, under case number 2:25-cv-0759-TLN-JDP. The parties stipulated to the order on October 7, 2025, and Magistrate Judge Jeremy D. Peterson entered it on October 8, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeremy D. Peterson
DECIDED	October 9, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-0759-TLN-JDP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery materials, and the court entered the order for good cause shown.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- consumer protection

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- consumer protection
- consumer credit
- discovery confidentiality

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed to enter a stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material.
2. Whether designation of discovery material as confidential under the protective order independently authorizes filing that material under seal.
3. What procedures and limitations should govern the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, return, and enforcement of protected discovery material.

HOLDINGS

1. Good cause existed to enter the parties' stipulated protective order because discovery was likely to involve confidential commercial information and sensitive personal and consumer information requiring protection from public disclosure and use outside the litigation.
2. The protective order does not itself authorize a party to file confidential material under seal; a party must separately comply with the applicable local rules and obtain a court order authorizing sealing of the specific material.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The parties’ mere designation of Disclosure or Discovery Material as CONFIDENTIAL does not—without the submission of competent evidence by declaration, establishing that the material sought to be filed under seal qualifies as confidential, privileged, or otherwise protectable—constitute good cause.” (at 2)

“Further, if a party requests sealing related to any dispositive motions, briefs, pleadings, deposition transcripts, other papers to be filed with the Court incorporate documents or information subject to this Order, or trial, then the party filing such papers shall designate such materials, or portions thereof, as “Confidential,” and then compelling reasons, not only good cause, for the sealing must be shown, and the relief sought shall be narrowly tailored to serve the specific interest to be protected.” (at 2-3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The litigation is expected to involve confidential business, financial, proprietary, trade-secret, and commercial information held by defendant IQ Data, as well as sensitive personal and consumer information relating to plaintiffs, including debt records, credit reports, Social Security numbers, financial records, tax records, medical information, and employment records. The parties sought a protective order to limit disclosure and use of protected discovery material while preserving reasonable use in prosecuting, defending, settling, and trying the action.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed this removed consumer-credit action on February 3, 2025. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order on October 7, 2025, and Magistrate Judge Jeremy D. Peterson entered it on October 8, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176 (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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/james-robertson-and-karyn-a-robertson-v-iq-data-owcidvts>