

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

J.R., as a minor by and through his Guardian Ad Litem Alicia Russell
v. County of Los Angeles, et al., and Does 1-20 inclusive

J.R. v. County of Los Angeles · No. 2:24-cv-06434-MEMF-MAA · Decided September 24, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered in J.R. v. County of Los Angeles, No. 2:24-cv-06434-MEMF-MAA, in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. It governs the designation, disclosure, use, challenge, handling, and final disposition of confidential discovery materials, including juvenile dependency case-file records and potentially protected law-enforcement information. The order was stipulated through counsel on September 12, 2025, and entered by the court on September 24, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maria A. Audero
DECIDED	September 24, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-06434-MEMF-MAA
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery material, and the court entered the order for good cause shown.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- civil rights
- section 1983
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- discovery confidentiality

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether good cause existed to enter the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material.

2. What procedures and limitations should govern the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and final disposition of protected material.

HOLDINGS

1. The court entered the stipulated protective order for good cause shown, limiting protection to information or items qualifying for confidential treatment and governing their use and disclosure during the litigation.
2. Protected material may be used only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the action, and the protective-order terms generally do not extend beyond commencement of trial unless the trial judge makes specific findings supporting continued confidentiality.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“this Stipulated Protective Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery” (§ 1)

“Once a case proceeds to trial, all of the information that was designated as confidential or maintained pursuant to this Stipulated Protective Order becomes public and presumptively will be available to all members of the public” (§ 5)

“A Receiving Party may use Protected Material that is disclosed or produced by another Party or by a Nonparty in connection with this Action only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle this Action.” (§ 8.1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action is expected to involve juvenile dependency case-file records, communications concerning the events alleged in the complaint, and documents or evidence held by law-enforcement agencies. The parties represented that some of this material may be unavailable to the public, privileged, or protected by statute, court rule, case law, or common law. The court found good cause to establish procedures governing designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and disposition of protected discovery material.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff J.R., proceeding through a guardian ad litem, filed a civil-rights action against the County of Los Angeles and other defendants. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order concerning anticipated discovery of juvenile dependency records, law-enforcement materials, and other potentially confidential or privileged information. The district court approved and entered the order on September 24, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)

