

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

A-Sha Foods USA Co., Inc. v. Momo Orchard Holdings, Inc.

A-Sha Foods · No. 2:25-cv-07140-SVW-MBK · Decided November 21, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered in A-Sha Foods USA Co., Inc. v. Momo Orchard Holdings, Inc. in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. It governs the designation, disclosure, use, challenge, filing, and disposition of confidential and highly confidential discovery materials. The order was stipulated to and entered on November 21, 2025, by Magistrate Judge Michael B. Kaufman.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Michael B. Kaufman
DECIDED	November 21, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-07140-SVW-MBK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to entry of a protective order governing confidential and highly confidential discovery material, and the magistrate judge entered the order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- commercial

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation
- commercial

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court should enter the parties' stipulated protective order governing designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and disposition of confidential discovery material.
- What procedures and standards should govern the treatment of confidential and highly confidential material produced in discovery.

HOLDINGS

1. The court entered the stipulated protective order and limited its protections to specific information or items that qualify for confidential treatment under applicable legal principles, rather than granting blanket protection to all discovery.
2. Protected material may be used only to prosecute, defend, or attempt to settle the action and may be disclosed only to the persons and under the conditions specified in the protective order.
3. A party or nonparty may challenge a confidentiality designation consistent with the scheduling order and applicable meet-and-confer procedures, but the designating party bears the burden of persuasion and the material remains protected until the court rules on the challenge.
4. The protective order does not itself authorize filing material under seal; a party seeking to seal protected material must comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing sealing of the specific material.
5. After final disposition, upon written request and within 60 days, each receiving party must return or destroy protected material and provide written certification, subject to counsel's right to retain specified archival materials that remain subject to the protective order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The parties acknowledge that this Order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or responses to discovery and that the protection it affords from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles.” (§ 1.1)

“Protected Material may only be filed under seal pursuant to a court order authorizing the sealing of the specific Protected Material at issue; good cause must be shown in the request to file under seal.” (§ 12.3)

“A Receiving Party may use Protected Material that is disclosed or produced by another Party or by a Non-Party in connection with this Action only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle this Action.” (§ 7.1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action involves competitors in the packaged noodle market and is expected to require discovery concerning trade secrets, noodle formulations, manufacturing methods, supplier and retailer terms, marketing expenditures, product roadmaps, investor materials, and other proprietary commercial information. The parties represented that disclosure of such material could cause competitive harm and could implicate third-party confidential information. Based on those representations, they sought a narrowly tailored protective order limiting use and disclosure of qualifying discovery material.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A-Sha Foods USA Co., Inc. and A-Sha Republic Inc. brought an action against Momo Orchard Holdings, Inc., which asserted a counterclaim against A-Sha Foods. The parties submitted a proposed stipulated protective order concerning discovery materials, and the court approved and entered it on November 21, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/a-sha-foods-usa-co-inc-v-momo-orchard-holdings-inc-tl2hfy80>