

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

A.A.B. v. City of Porterville

A.A.B. · No. 1:25-cv-00261-EPG · Decided April 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California partially approves the parties’ proposed stipulated protective order. The Court limits confidential information to specified categories, including medical records, personal information, records identifying the minor plaintiff, law-enforcement personnel records, third-party reports, and internal-affairs investigations, and clarifies that court practices and rules govern where they conflict with the order.

OPINION

A.A.B. v. City of Porterville

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 A.A.B., a minor, by and through his Case No. 1:25-cv-00261-EPG guardian ad litem,
Dnieper Vegavillalobos, 11 Plaintiff,

12 ORDER APPROVING, IN PART, PROPOSED

v. STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER

13 CITY OF PORTERVILLE, et al., (ECF No. 16) 14 Defendants. 15 16 This matter is before the
Court on the parties’ proposed stipulated protective order. (ECF 17 No. 16). Upon review, the
Court will approve, in part, the proposed protective order. 18 The Court finds the proposed
protective order acceptable in most respects. However, the 19 parties define confidential
information to mean “information (regardless of how it is generated, 20 stored or maintained) or
tangible things that qualify for protection under Federal Rule of Civil 21 Procedure 26(c).” (ECF
No. 16, p. 1). Such a definition improperly allows the parties to deem 22 information confidential
so long as they themselves believe that it qualifies for protection without 23 ever disclosing the
types of information at issue contrary to Local Rule 141(c)(1), which requires 24 as follows: “A
description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with 25 the
description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., 26
customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child).” 27 However, the parties elsewhere
identify “types of information they believe to be eligible 28 for protection,” which include the
following: 1 e Medical records of the minor Plaintiff A.A.B.; 2 e Personal information of parties

in this litigation or third parties, including but not limited to social security numbers, home addresses, phone numbers, 3 and financial records; 4 e Information that reveals the identity—including the name and/or image— of the minor Plaintiff A.A.B. or otherwise invades his anonymity in this 5 litigation[;] 6 e Personnel records of law enforcement officers; 7 e Reports pertaining to third parties not involved in this litigation; and g e Internal affairs/professional standards investigations. (ECF No. 16, pp. 1-2). 9 The Court will limit the parties’ definition of confidential information to such information. 10 Additionally, the Court notes that “a protective order may not bind the Court or its 11 personnel.” *Rangel v. Forest River, Inc.*, No. EDCV 17-0613 JFW (SS), 2017 WL 2825922, at *2 12 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2017). Thus, to the extent that any part of the protective order conflicts with 13 the Court’s established practices or Rules, the Court’s established practices or Rules will govern. 14 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the parties’ proposed stipulated protective order (ECF IS | No. 16) is approved, in part, as explained above. 16 17 | TPIS SO ORDERED. | Dated: _ April 23, 2025 [Jee hey

19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28