

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Janet Cabrera v. Nissan North America, Inc.

Cabrera · No. 1:25-cv-00737-JLT-EPG · Decided September 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California partially granted the parties’ second stipulated motion for a protective order. The court limited confidential information to the categories supported by the parties’ good-cause statement and clarified that the court’s established practices and applicable rules govern any conflicting protective-order procedures.

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 22, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00737-JLT-EPG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly stipulated to a second motion for a protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; nonprecedential except as permitted by applicable law.
PARTIES	Janet Cabrera v. Nissan North America, Inc.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- consumer protection

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the parties' second stipulated motion for a protective order should be granted.
- What categories of information may properly be designated as confidential under the protective order.
- Whether the protective order may bind the court or override the court's established rules and practices.

HOLDINGS

1. The court granted the second motion for a protective order in part.
2. A protective order may not bind the court or its personnel, and the court's established rules and practices govern to the extent the protective order conflicts with them.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“*a protective order may not bind the Court or its personnel.*” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff seeks information, records, and communications concerning Nissan's internal lemon-law policies and procedures, consumer information, and consumer complaints. The parties anticipated that discovery could involve trade secrets and confidential business, financial, technical, commercial, proprietary, and privacy-related information. They submitted a second stipulated protective-order motion defining confidential information by reference to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and their good-cause statement.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously denied the parties' first stipulated motion for a protective order without prejudice because the parties had not complied with the court's rules and established practices. On the second motion, the court granted protection in part, limiting confidential information to the categories supported by the parties' good-cause statement and providing that the court's own rules and practices control over conflicting provisions.

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)