

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA, VALDOSTA DIVISION

Nick M. Bajalia and Monique Bajalia v. Giantex Inc., et al.

Bajalia · No. 7:24-CV-134 (LAG) · Decided January 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia grants the parties’ consent motion for a protective order concerning the plaintiffs’ confidential medical information and records. The court adopts the parties’ proposed protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Valdosta Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Leslie A. Gardner
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Valdosta Division
DECIDED	January 21, 2026
DOCKET	7:24-CV-134 (LAG)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly moved for entry of a consent protective order concerning the plaintiffs' confidential medical information and records.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute medical records privacy civil procedure health law

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure discovery health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should grant the parties' consent motion and enter a protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) to protect confidential medical information and records during discovery.

HOLDINGS

1. A stipulated protective order is warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) to facilitate discovery where the court finds good cause, and the court therefore granted the parties' joint motion and adopted their proposed consent protective order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Stipulated protective orders have become “commonplace in the federal courts” to allow the parties “to designate particular documents as confidential . . . and postpone[] the necessary ‘good cause’ required for entry of a protective order until the confidential designation is challenged.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties sought protection for the plaintiffs' confidential medical information and records in connection with discovery. They submitted a proposed stipulated protective order and jointly requested its entry.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia. The parties filed a consent motion for protective order, which the court granted and adopted as the court's order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Chicago Trib. Co. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc., 263 F.3d 1304, 1307 (11th Cir. 2001)
- In re Alexander Grant & Co. Litig., 820 F.2d 352, 356 (11th Cir. 1987)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION NICK M BAJALIA and: MONIQUE BAJALIA,: Plaintiffs,: v.: CASE
NO.: 7:24-CV-134 (LAG) GIANTEX INC., et al.,: Defendants.: ORDER Before the Court is the
Parties’ Consent Motion for Protective Order. (Doc. 23). Therein, the Parties ask the Court to enter
a protective order to protect Plaintiff’s confidential medical information and records.

(See *id.* at 2–3). Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c), the Court may enter a protective order upon finding good cause. Stipulated protective orders have become “commonplace in the federal courts” to allow the parties “to designate particular documents as confidential... and postpone[] the necessary ‘good cause’ required for entry of a protective order until the confidential designation is challenged.” Chicago Trib.

Co. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc., 263 F.3d 1304, 1307 (11th Cir. 2001) (citing *In re Alexander Grant & Co. Litig.*, 820 F.2d 352, 356 (11th Cir. 1987)). Accordingly, the Court finds a protective order is warranted to facilitate discovery.

The Parties' Joint Motion (Doc. 23) is GRANTED, and the Parties' proposed Consent Protective Order (Doc. 23) is hereby ADOPTED and made the ORDER of the Court. SO ORDERED, this 21st day of January, 2026. /s/ Leslie A. Gardner LESLIE A. GARDNER, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT