

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Eric Rios v. County of Los Angeles

Rios v. County of Los Angeles, No. 2:24-cv-04782-MEMF-MBK (C.D. Cal. May 27, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-04782-MEMF-MBK · Decided May 27, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a proposed stipulated protective order governing the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and disposition of confidential discovery materials in Eric Rios v. County of Los Angeles. It addresses confidential medical information, peace-officer personnel and investigative records, privileged material, and other sensitive information in a federal civil-rights action.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael B. Kaufman
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	May 27, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-04782-MEMF-MBK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to a protective order governing confidential discovery materials, and the magistrate judge entered the proposed order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- privilege
- work product doctrine
- police misconduct
- municipal liability

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights litigation
- discovery
- evidence and privilege
- municipal liability

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should enter the parties' stipulated protective order governing the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and disposition of confidential discovery materials.

2. What procedures and protections should govern confidential law-enforcement personnel records, investigative materials, medical records, privileged materials, and other private information produced in discovery.

HOLDINGS

1. The court entered the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery materials in the action.
2. Material designated as confidential under the order may be used only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the action and may be disclosed only to the authorized categories of persons subject to the order's conditions.
3. A party or nonparty may challenge a confidentiality designation, but the designating party bears the burden of persuasion, and the material remains protected under the designation until the court rules or the designation is waived or withdrawn.
4. Designation of discovery material as confidential does not authorize filing that material under seal; a party seeking to file protected material under seal must comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing sealing of the specific material.
5. The protective-order protections do not extend beyond commencement of trial for court-filed information to be introduced, subject to any trial judge order based on compelling reasons; after final disposition, protected material generally must be returned or destroyed within the specified period upon written request, subject to counsel's archival-copy exception.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The parties acknowledge that this Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery and that the protection it affords from public disclosure and from use for any purpose other than prosecuting this litigation may be warranted.” (§ 1.1)

“Once a case proceeds to trial, all of the court-filed information to be introduced that was previously designated as confidential or maintained pursuant to this protective order becomes public and will be presumptively available to all members of the public, including the press, unless compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings to proceed otherwise are made to the trial judge in advance of the trial.” (§ 4)

“The burden of persuasion in any such challenge proceeding shall be on the Designating Party.” (§ 6.3)

“Protected Material may only be filed under seal pursuant to a court order authorizing the sealing of the specific Protected Material at issue; good cause must be shown in the request to file under seal.” (§ 12.3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff alleges that, during a March 3, 2023 incident, County of Los Angeles and Deputy Ty Shelton used excessive force in violation of the Fourth Amendment. The action also includes allegations of municipal liability, negligence, assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and violation of California's Bane

Act. The anticipated discovery includes medical records, private information, and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department personnel and investigative records concerning peace officers.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Eric Rios brought claims arising from an alleged use of excessive force by Los Angeles County and Deputy Ty Shelton. The parties represented that discovery would involve confidential and private information, including medical records and law-enforcement personnel and investigative records. On May 27, 2025, the parties submitted a stipulated protective order, which the court ordered.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Sanchez v. Santa Ana Police Department, 936 F.2d 1027, 1033-34 (9th Cir. 1991)
- Halton v. City of Stockton, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14665, at *2-3, 12-13 (E.D. Cal. 2012)
- Soto v. City of Concord, 162 F.R.D. 603, 613 & n.4, 616 (N.D. Cal. 1995)
- Maricopa Audubon Society v. United States Forest Service, 108 F.3d 1089, 1092-95 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Kelly v. City of San Jose, 114 F.R.D. 654, 668-71 (N.D. Cal. 1987)
- Hamstreet v. Duncan, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89702 (D. Or. 2007)
- Admiral Insurance Co. v. United States District Court, 881 F.2d 1486, 1492, 1495 (9th Cir. 1989)
- Becerra v. Superior Court, 44 Cal. App. 5th 897 (2020)
- Walnut Creek Police Officers' Association v. City of Walnut Creek, 33 Cal. App. 5th 940 (2019)
- Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)