

**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

OPINION

BAJALIA

PER CURIAM.

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