

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Urban Fab Corp. v. Entro, Inc., et al.

Urban Fab · No. 2:25-cv-01061-PA-PVCx · Decided November 7, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order entered in Urban Fab Corp. v. Entro, Inc., et al., a copyright-infringement action in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. It governs the designation, use, disclosure, challenge, filing, and final disposition of confidential discovery materials. The order was entered for good cause on November 7, 2025, by Magistrate Judge Pedro V. Castillo.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Pedro V. Castillo
DECIDED	November 7, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01061-PA-PVCx
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.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court entered the stipulated protective order upon a showing of good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential case-management order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- copyright law
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- copyright
- commercial litigation
- discovery and confidentiality

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause existed to enter the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material.
2. What procedures and limitations should govern the designation, disclosure, challenge, filing, use, and final disposition of protected discovery material.

HOLDINGS

1. The court entered the stipulated protective order upon the parties' showing of good cause, subject to the order's stated limitations and procedures.
2. The protective order applies only to specific information or items qualifying for confidential treatment and does not itself authorize filing protected material under seal or extend the protections beyond commencement of trial, absent further trial-court findings.
3. Protected material may be used only to prosecute, defend, or attempt to settle the action and may be disclosed only to the categories of persons and under the conditions specified in 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.” (at 1-2)

“Once a case proceeds to trial, all of the information that was designated as confidential or maintained pursuant to this protective order becomes public and will be presumptively available to all members of the public, including the press, unless compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings to proceed otherwise are made to the trial judge in advance of the trial.” (at 4)

“FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN BY THE PARTIES’ STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.” (at 12)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action involves a copyright claim concerning an allegedly copied fabric design and allegedly infringing products. The parties anticipated that discovery would involve confidential information concerning revenues, costs, pricing, licensing, profits, financial information, expenses, marketing channels, and discounts. The parties represented that disclosure of this information could harm them competitively in the fashion industry.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Urban Fab Corp. brought a copyright-infringement action alleging that defendants copied a fabric design and sold allegedly infringing products. Anticipating discovery of confidential financial, proprietary, and business information, the parties submitted a stipulated protective order. The court entered the order on November 7, 2025.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kamakana v. City and 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/urban-fab-corp-v-entro-inc-et-al-w3d9bmkg>