

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.

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	April 23, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00261-EPG
DISPOSITION	approved
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered the parties' proposed stipulated protective order during discovery in a civil-rights action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the proposed stipulated protective order for compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Local Rule 141(c)(1).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the proposed stipulated protective order adequately described the types of information eligible for protection under Local Rule 141(c)(1).
2. Whether the protective order could bind the court or its personnel or override the court's established practices and rules.

HOLDINGS

1. The parties may not define confidential information solely by reference to their own determination that information qualifies for protection under Rule 26(c); the protective order must describe in general terms the types of information eligible for protection as required by Local Rule 141(c)(1).
2. A protective order may not bind the court or court personnel, and the court's established practices and rules govern to the extent of any conflict with the protective order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A protective order may not bind the Court or its personnel.” (at 1)

“A description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child).” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties proposed defining confidential information as information or tangible things that qualify for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). The proposed order also identified specific categories of information, including the minor plaintiff's medical records, personal identifying and financial information, information revealing the minor's identity, law-enforcement personnel records, third-party reports, and internal-affairs investigations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties submitted a proposed stipulated protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Eastern District of California Local Rule 141. The court found the proposed order acceptable in most respects but approved it only in part, limiting the definition of confidential information and clarifying that court practices and rules control.

DISPOSITION

approved

CASES CITED

- Rangel v. Forest River, Inc., No. EDCV 17-0613 JFW (SS), 2017 WL 2825922, at *2 (C.D. Cal. June 29, 2017)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/a-a-b-v-city-of-porterville-s3fhtz9c>