

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Youmans v. Chelan-Douglas Land Trust

No. 2:25-cv-00290-RLP (E.D. Wash. Jan. 13, 2026) · No. 2:25-cv-00290-RLP · Decided January 13, 2026

SUMMARY

This document is an order from the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington addressing the parties’ Amended Stipulated Protective Order in Eunice Youmans v. Chelan-Douglas Land Trust. The court grants protection for specified medical, financial, tax, and personnel information but declines to protect membership-list contact information without a more specific showing of good cause. The order sets procedures governing designation, disclosure, challenges, filing under seal, and return or destruction of protected materials.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rebecca L. Pennell
DECIDED	January 13, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00290-RLP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered the parties' amended stipulated protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The party seeking a protective order bears the burden of showing good cause and specific prejudice for each document or category of information sought to be protected.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	Eunice Youmans v. Chelan-Douglas Land Trust, "Doe(s) 1-100" employees of Chelan-Douglas Land Trust, "Corporation(s) XYZ 1-100"

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court could enter the parties' stipulated protective order only upon an independent finding of good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).
2. Whether the parties demonstrated good cause to protect the specified medical, financial, tax, personnel, and membership-list information from disclosure.

HOLDINGS

1. A court may enter a stipulated protective order under Rule 26(c) only when the party seeking protection demonstrates good cause and specific prejudice; the good-cause requirement is not waived by the parties' stipulation.
2. Good cause supported protection of Plaintiff's medical records and bills, bank-account and financial information, tax records, and personnel files of departed Executive Directors, but the parties did not establish good cause to protect home addresses, phone numbers, and contact information in membership lists.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The requirement to demonstrate good cause cannot be waived, and remains even where the parties stipulate to the order." (at 2)

"The Court finds the parties have not demonstrated good cause to seal the home addresses, phone numbers, and contact information for membership lists." (at 2)

"The parties' Amended Stipulated Protective Order, ECF No. 15, is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part." (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The proposed protective order concerned Plaintiff's medical records and bills, bank-account and other financial information, tax records, personnel files of departed Executive Directors, and home addresses, phone numbers, and contact information in membership lists. The court found substantial privacy interests and potential disclosure-related harm for the medical, financial, tax, and personnel information, but found no sufficient showing that the membership lists were trade secrets or that disclosure would harm First Amendment rights.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties submitted an Amended Stipulated Protective Order, ECF No. 15, seeking protection for specified discovery materials, including medical and financial records, personnel files, and membership-list contact information. The district court independently assessed whether the parties demonstrated good cause and granted the request in part while denying protection for the membership-list contact information.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Midland National Life Insurance Co. Annuity Sales Practices Litigation, 686 F.3d 1115, 1119 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Cordero v. Stemilt AG Services, 142 F.4th 1201, 1207 (9th Cir. 2025)
- Foltz v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., 331 F.3d 1122, 1130-31 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Beckman Industries, Inc. v. International Insurance Co., 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992)
- San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v. United States District Court for the Northern District of California (San Jose), 187 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Yellowcake, Inc. v. Dashgo, Inc., 2022 WL 3226824, at *10 (E.D. Cal. July 21, 2022)
- Snedigar v. Hoddersen, 114 Wn.2d at 163-64, 786 P.2d 781 (1990)
- Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1186 (9th Cir. 2006)
- In re Roman Catholic Archbishop of Portland in Oregon, 661 F.3d 417, 428 (9th Cir. 2011)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-was/2026/youmans-v-chelan-douglas-land-trust-t3cg2x87>