

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Daher v. County of Sacramento

No. 2:24-cv-02611-JAM-SCR (E.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-02611-JAM-SCR · Decided March 3, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a proposed stipulated protective order governing the designation, disclosure, use, challenge, filing, and disposition of confidential personnel files and certain personal information in Daher v. County of Sacramento. It was stipulated by the parties and signed as ordered on March 3, 2025, by a United States Magistrate Judge for the Eastern District of California.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sean C. Riordan
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-02611-JAM-SCR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties jointly submitted a proposed stipulated protective order concerning personnel files and other confidential information during discovery. The magistrate judge entered the order pursuant to the parties' stipulation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential case-specific stipulated protective order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute civil procedure civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure civil rights discovery and confidentiality

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should enter the parties' stipulated protective order governing the disclosure, use, challenge, and disposition of specified confidential discovery materials.

2. Whether the protective order should make clear that confidentiality designations do not automatically authorize filing materials under seal.

HOLDINGS

1. The court entered the parties' stipulated protective order, limiting protection to specified information that qualifies for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and restricting its use to the litigation.
2. A designation of discovery material as confidential under the protective order does not itself authorize filing that material under seal; a party must comply with the Eastern District of California's sealing procedures or obtain a court order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Parties acknowledge that this protective order does not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or discovery activity, and that the protection it affords extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to such protection under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c).” (at 1)

“The Parties further acknowledge that this protective order does not entitle any party to file information designated as protected or confidential under seal, where E.D. Cal. L.R. 141 sets forth the procedures that must be followed and reflects the standards that will be applied when a party seeks permission from the Court to file material under seal.” (at 1)

“Pursuant to the Parties’ stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED.” (at 11)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The litigation concerns claims brought by Elisa Daher individually and as successor-in-interest to Jaime Naranjo against Sacramento County, the Sacramento County Sheriff's Office, and individual defendants. Discovery was expected to involve personnel files, investigative and disciplinary materials, personal health information, sensitive financial information, and personal identifying information. The parties sought a protective order limiting disclosure and use of designated information while preserving the requirements governing confidentiality challenges and filings under seal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed the action on September 26, 2024 and filed a first amended complaint on December 12, 2024. On March 3, 2025, the parties submitted a stipulated protective order, which the court ordered entered.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Roman Catholic Archbishop of Portland, 661 F.3d 417, 424 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc., 785 F.2d 1108, 1122 (3d Cir. 1986)

OPINION

Daher v. County of Sacramento

PER CURIAM.

1/PORTER | SCOTT

2 A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

Carl L. Fessenden, SBN 161494 3, || cfessenden@porterscott.com Cruz Rocha, SBN 279293 4 ||
crocha@porterscott.com 2180 Harvard Street, Suite 500 5 Sacramento, California 95815

TEL: 916.929.1481

© || FAX: 916.927.3706

7 Attorneys for Defendants

8 1| COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE,
ANDREW

SEIDEL, DAVID CUNEO, SARA DLUGOPOLSKI, PEDRO AVALOS, CARLOS RODRIGUEZ,

9 1] MARCELINA MARTINEZ, AIMEE RIVERA, JOE DURAN, WILLIAM ROBINSON,
ANDREW

10 GONZALES, CHRISTOPHER PICANCO, JOHN LOPES, SERGEANT LOWERY, ALEX
ZAKRZEWSKI, BRANDON WRIGHT, DETECTIVE RICHARD S. HAMILTON, LINDSEY
LAMB,

11 CHRIS BRITTON

Exempt from Filing Fees Pursuant to Government Code § 6103

B UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

14 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 || ELISA DAHER in her individual capacity CASE NO. 2:24-cv-02611-JAM-SCR and as
successor-in-interest to JAIME

16 NARANJO, [PROPOSED] STIPULATED PROTECTIVE

17 ORDER RE: PERSONNEL FILES

Plaintiff,

18 FAC: 12/12/2024

19 Complaint Filed: 9/26/24

20 || COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO,

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S

21 || OFFICE, ANDREW SEIDEL, DAVID

CUNEO, SARA DLUGOPOLSKI, PEDRO

AVALOS, CARLOS RODRIGUEZ,

23) MARCELINA MARTINEZ, AIMEE

RIVERA, JOE DURAN, WILLIAM

24 ||ROBINSON, ANDREW GONZALES,

5 CHRISTOPHER PICANCO, JOHN LOPES,

SERGEANT LOWERY, ALEX

26 } ZAKRZEWSKI, BRANDON WRIGHT,

DETECTIVE RICHARD S. HAMILTON,

27 || LINDSEY LAMB, AND CHRIS BRITTON,

28 Defendants. □

[PROPOSED] STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER RE: PERSONNEL FILES

1 STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER

2 A. PURPOSE AND LIMITATION

3 The Parties believe that the disclosure and discovery activity concerning the materials described
4 in section C of this stipulated protective order is likely to involve production of confidential or
private 5 information for which protection from public disclosure and from use for any purpose
other than 6 prosecuting this litigation would be warranted. The Parties acknowledge that this
protective order does 7 not confer blanket protections on all disclosures or discovery activity, and
that the protection it affords 8 extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to
such protection under Fed. R. Civ. P. 9 26(c). The Parties further acknowledge that this protective
order does not entitle any party to file 10 information designated as protected or confidential under
seal, where E.D. Cal. L.R. 141 sets forth the 11 procedures that must be followed and reflects the
standards that will be applied when a party seeks 12 permission from the Court to file material
under seal. 13 The Parties jointly request entry of this proposed Stipulated Protective Order to
limit the 14 disclosure, dissemination, and use of certain identified categories of confidential
information.

15 B. DEFINITIONS

16 The following definitions shall apply to this Stipulated Protective Order: 17 1. The “Action”
shall mean and refer to the above-captioned matter and to all actions now or 18 later consolidated
with the Action, and any appeal from the Action and from any other action consolidated 19 at any
time under the above-captioned matter, through final judgment. 20 2. “Documents” or
“Confidential Documents” shall mean the Documents that Defendants 21 designate as
“Confidential” in the manner set forth in this Stipulated Protective Order. 22 3. “Confidential”
shall mean information designated “Confidential” pursuant to this 23 Protective Order.
Information designated “Confidential” shall be information that is determined in good 24 faith by
the attorneys representing the Designating Party to be subject to protection pursuant to Fed. R. 25
Civ. P. 26(c). Confidential Documents, material, and/or information shall be used solely for
purposes of 26 litigation. Confidential Information shall not be used by the non-Designating Party
for any business or 27 other purpose, unless agreed to in writing by all Parties to this action or as
authorized by further order of 28 the Court. 1 4. “Defendants” shall mean COUNTY OF
SACRAMENTO, SACRAMENTO COUNTY

2 SHERIFF’S OFFICE, ANDREW SEIDEL, DAVID CUNEO, SARA DLUGOPOLSKI, PEDRO

3 AVALOS, CARLOS RODRIGUEZ, MARCELINA MARTINEZ, AIMEE RIVERA, JOE

DURAN,

4 WILLIAM ROBINSON, ANDREW GONZALES, CHRISTOPHER PICANCO, JOHN LOPES,
5 SERGEANT LOWERY, ALEX ZAKRZEWSKI, BRANDON WRIGHT, DETECTIVE
RICHARD S. 6 HAMILTON, LINDSEY LAMB, and CHRIS BRITTON. 7 5. "Plaintiff" shall
mean ELISA DAHER in her individual capacity and as successor-in- 8 interest to JAIME
NARANJO. 9 6. "Parties" shall mean Plaintiff and Defendants, identified above.

10 C. INFORMATION COVERED

11 Covered Information: 12 Pursuant to E.D. Cal. L.R. 141.1(c)(1), a description of the
information eligible for protection 13 under this Stipulated Protective Order is limited to the
following: 14 1. Personnel Files of ANDREW SEIDEL, including any documents related to
investigation 15 of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of
discipline (except 16 to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal
Code § 832.7). 17 2. Personnel Files of DAVID CUNEO, including any documents related to
investigation of 18 conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of
discipline (except 19 to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal
Code § 832.7). 20 3. Personnel Files of SARA DLUGOPOLSKI, including any documents related
to 21 investigation of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 22
discipline (except to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal 23
Code § 832.7). 24 4. Personnel Files of PEDRO AVALOS, including any documents related to
investigation of 25 conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of
discipline (except 26 to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal
Code § 832.7). 27 5. Personnel Files of CARLOS RODRIGUEZ, including any documents related
to 28 investigation of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 1
discipline (except to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal 2 Code
§ 832.7). 3 6. Personnel Files of MARCELINA MARTINEZ, including any documents related to 4
investigation of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 5 discipline
(except to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal 6 Code § 832.7).
7 7. Personnel Files of AIMEE RIVERA, including any documents related to investigation of 8
conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of discipline (except 9 to the
extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 10 8. Personnel
Files of JOE DURAN, including any documents related to investigation of 11 conduct, complaints
or investigations or complaints, and imposition of discipline (except 12 to the extent subject to
disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 13 9. Personnel Files of
WILLIAM ROBINSON, including any documents related to 14 investigation of conduct,
complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 15 discipline (except to the extent
subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal 16 Code § 832.7). 17 10. Personnel
Files of ANDREW GONZALES, including any documents related to 18 investigation of conduct,
complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 19 discipline (except to the extent

subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 21 11. Personnel Files of CHRISTOPHER PICANCO, including any documents related to 22 investigation of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 23 discipline (except to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 25 12. Personnel Files of JOHN LOPES, including any documents related to investigation of 26 conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of discipline (except 27 to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 28 13. Personnel Files of SERGEANT LOWERY, including any documents related to 1 investigation of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 2 discipline (except to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 4 14. Personnel Files of ALEX ZAKRZEWSKI, including any documents related to 5 investigation of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 6 discipline (except to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 8 15. Personnel Files of BRANDON WRIGHT, including any documents related to 9 investigation of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 10 discipline (except to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 12 16. Personnel Files of RICHARD S. HAMILTON, including any documents related to 13 investigation of conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of 14 discipline (except to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 16 17. Personnel Files of LINDSEY LAMB, including any documents related to investigation of 17 conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of discipline (except 18 to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 19 18. Personnel Files of CHRIS BRITTON, including any documents related to investigation of 20 conduct, complaints or investigations or complaints, and imposition of discipline (except 21 to the extent subject to disclosure, including pursuant to California Penal Code § 832.7). 22 19. Personal health information of any Party, including records of medical and/or mental health 23 evaluation, diagnosis, and treatment. 24 20. Sensitive financial information of any Party, including bank statements, credit card 25 statements, tax returns, investment records, assets, and liabilities. 26 21. Personal identifying information of any Party, including social security numbers and home 27 addresses. 28 Particularized Need for Protection: 1 Pursuant to E.D. Cal. L.R. 141.1(c)(2), the Parties assert that there exists a specific, particularized 2 need for protection as to the information covered by this Stipulated Protective Order. In good faith, it is 3 represented to the Court that the materials designated to be covered by this Stipulated Protective Order 4 are limited solely to those which would qualify for protection under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c), and does not 5 include information which has been subject to protection on a blanket or indiscriminate basis. See e.g., In 6 Re Roman Catholic Archbishop of Portland, 661 F.3d 417, 424 (9th Cir. 2011) (identifying a two-part test 7 for obtaining a protective order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)). 8 Showing of Need for a Protective Order: 9 Pursuant to E.D. Cal. L.R. 141.1(c)(3), the need for protection pursuant to this Stipulated

10 Protective Order is for the convenience of the Parties and the Court. The Parties seek to avoid litigation 11 and expenditure of resources concerning a potential Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) motion for protective order. The 12 entry of this Stipulated Protective Order prevents the parties and the Court from conducting the usual 13 document-by-document analysis necessary to obtain protection under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c), in favor of a 14 procedure whereby presumptive protection is afforded based on the Parties good faith representations. See 15 e.g., *Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.*, 785 F.2d 1108, 1122 (3d Cir. 1986) (“[T]he burden of justifying the 16 confidentiality of each and every document sought to be covered by a protective order remains on the 17 party seeking the protective order; any other conclusion would turn [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 26(c) on its head.”). 18 As a result, production may be made with this Protective Order in place and, if necessary, will permit 19 discrete and narrowed challenges to the documents covered by this Protective Order.

20 D. TERMS OF THE PROTECTIVE ORDER

21 Confidential Documents subject to protection may be designated as “Confidential” by Defendants 22 and produced subject to the following Stipulated Protective Order: 23 1. The Confidential Documents shall be used solely in connection with the above-captioned 24 civil case, and in the preparation and trial of the case. The Parties do not waive any objections to the 25 admissibility of the documents or portions thereof in future proceedings in this case, including trial. 26 2. The Parties will designate the Confidential Documents as confidential by affixing a mark 27 labelling them “Confidential.” 28 3. The Confidential Documents may only be disclosed to the following persons: 1 (a) Attorneys and litigation support staff of BRAUNHAGEY & BORDEN LLP, 2 DISABILITY LAW UNITED, and NATIONAL POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT as counsel 3 for Plaintiff in the case enumerated above; 4 (b) Carl L. Fessenden and Cruz Rocha of PORTER SCOTT, partners and associate attorneys 5 in that office, as counsel for Defendants in the case enumerated above; 6 (c) Paralegal, clerical, and secretarial personnel regularly employed by counsel referred to in 7 subparts (a) and (b) immediately above, including stenographic deposition reporters or videographers 8 retained in connection with this action; 9 (d) Court personnel, including stenographic reporters or videographers engaged in proceedings 10 as are necessarily incidental to the preparation for the trial in the civil action; 11 (e) Any expert, consultant, or investigator retained in connection with this action; however, 12 such persons must be advised of and abide by this protective order; 13 (f) The finder of facts at the time of trial, subject to the court’s rulings on in limine motions 14 and objections of counsel; 15 (g) Witnesses during their depositions in this action. If confidential documents are used in the 16 deposition, the documents must be identified as “Confidential” and the portion of the deposition in which 17 the documents are described should also be considered confidential; and 18 (h) Elisa Daher. 19 4. Information covered by this Protective Order shall not be filed on the public docket unless: 20 (1) prior to filing, the filing party provides at least 24-hour notice to the Designating Party of its intent to 21 file, and the Designating Party consents in writing to de-designate the material or redacts the portion of 22 the document the Designating Party asserts is Confidential; or (2) the filing party

obtains an order from 23 the Court authorizing the filing of such materials under seal pursuant to E.D. L.R. 141. If permission to 24 file under seal is granted, the Confidential Documents will be filed and served in accordance with E.D. 25 Cal. L.R. 141. 26 5. The designation of the Confidential Documents as “Confidential” and the subsequent 27 production thereof is without prejudice to the right of any party to oppose the admissibility of the 28 Confidential Documents or information contained therein. 1 6. Any party or non-party may challenge a designation of confidentiality at any time. A party 2 or non-party does not waive its right to challenge a confidentiality designation by electing not to mount a 3 challenge promptly after the original designation is disclosed. The Challenging Party shall initiate the 4 dispute resolution process by providing written notice of each designation it is challenging and describing 5 the basis for each challenge. The parties shall attempt to resolve each challenge in good faith and must 6 begin the process by conferring directly (in voice-to-voice dialogue; other forms of communication are 7 not sufficient) within seven (7) days of the date of service of notice. In conferring, the Challenging Party 8 must explain the basis for its belief that the confidentiality designation was not proper and must give the 9 Designating Party an opportunity to review the designated material, to reconsider the circumstances, and, 10 if no change in designation is offered, to explain the basis for the chosen designation. A Challenging 11 Party may proceed to the next stage of the challenge process only if it has engaged in this meet and confer 12 process first or establishes that the Designating Party is unwilling to participate in the meet and confer 13 process in a timely manner. If the Parties cannot resolve a challenge without Court intervention, the 14 Designating Party shall file and serve a motion for protective order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) and 15 E.D. Cal. L.R. 251 within twenty-one (21) days of the initial notice of challenge or within seven (7) days 16 of the parties agreeing that the meet and confer process will not resolve their dispute, whichever is earlier. 17 Failure by the Designating Party to make such a motion within twenty-one (21) days (or seven (7) days, 18 if applicable) shall automatically waive the “Confidential” designation for each challenged designation. 19 In addition, the Challenging Party may file a motion challenging a confidentiality designation at any time 20 if there is good cause for doing so. The burden of persuasion in any such challenge proceeding shall be 21 on the Designating Party. Unless the Designating Party has waived the confidentiality designation by 22 failing to file a motion to retain confidentiality as described above, all parties shall continue to afford the 23 material in question the level of protection to which it is entitled under the Designating Party’s designation 24 until the Court rules on the challenge. 25 7. Should the Confidential Documents or any information contained therein be disclosed, 26 through inadvertence or otherwise, to any person not authorized to receive it under this Stipulated 27 Protective Order, the disclosing person(s) shall promptly (a) inform counsel for Defendants of the 28 recipient(s) and the circumstances of the unauthorized disclosure to the relevant producing person(s) and 1 (b) use best efforts to bind the recipient(s) to the terms of this Protective Order. 2 8. The Confidential Documents shall not lose its confidential status because it was 3 inadvertently or unintentionally disclosed to a person not

authorized to receive it under this Stipulated Protective Order. 5 9. The protections conferred by this Stipulated Protective Order cover the information defined 6 above, as well as any information copied from the materials. However, the protections conferred by this 7 Stipulated Protective Order do not cover: (A) any information that is in the public domain at the time of 8 disclosure or which subsequently becomes part of the public domain after its disclosure, including 9 becoming part of the public record through trial or otherwise; and (B) any information known prior to the 10 disclosure or obtained after the disclosure from a source who obtained the information lawfully and under 11 no obligation of confidentiality. 12 10. Within 90 days after this litigation concludes by settlement, final judgment, or final order, 13 including all appeals, all documents designated as containing Confidential Information, including copies 14 as defined above, must be returned to the party who previously produced the document unless: (1) the 15 document has been offered into evidence or filed without restriction as to disclosure; (2) the parties agree 16 to destruction of the document to the extent practicable in lieu of return; or (3) as to documents bearing 17 the notations, summations, or other mental impressions of the receiving party, that party elects to destroy 18 the documents and certifies to the producing party that it has done so. All confidential documents or 19 information that is subject to this protective order shall be returned or destroyed upon the conclusion of 20 this litigation, either through the settlement of the case, the dismissal of the case or the entry of a Final 21 Order (i.e., an Order not subject to further appeal). Nothing in this section requires a party, its counsel, or 22 consultants to delete discovery material which may reside on one or more backup tapes or other media 23 maintained for purposes of disaster recovery, business continuity, or other reasons, except that the parties 24 agree that all such Confidential Information will continue to be confidential under this Order. 25 11. Notwithstanding the above requirements to return or destroy documents, counsel for the 26 Parties may retain a copy of Confidential Information as part of counsels' case files. After the conclusion 27 of this litigation, the Confidential Documents will remain confidential. "Conclusion" of this litigation 28 means a termination of the case following a trial, settlement, or dismissal of the Action with prejudice for 1 any other reason. 2 12. This Stipulated Protective Order shall remain in full force and effect and shall continue to 3 be binding on all parties and affected persons until this litigation terminates, subject to any subsequent 4 modifications of this Stipulated Protective Order for good cause shown by this Court or any Court having 5 jurisdiction over an appeal of this action. Upon termination of this litigation, the parties agree the 6 Stipulated Protective Order shall continue in force as a private agreement between the parties. 7 13. The parties may request additional records to be subject to this Stipulated Protective Order. 8 If a party believes a document to be produced should be subject to this Stipulated Protective Order, the 9 parties must meet and confer. If there is agreement, the parties shall submit an amendment to this 10 Stipulated Protective Order to identify the additional documents. If the parties cannot agree, a Motion for 11 Protective Order shall be filed accordingly. 12 14. During the pendency of this lawsuit, the Court shall (a) make such amendments, 13 modifications and additions to this Stipulated Protective Order as it may deem

appropriate upon good 14 cause shown; and, (b) adjudicate any dispute arising under it. 15 IT IS
SO STIPULATED: 16 17 Dated: March 3, 2025 PORTER SCOTT

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

18 19 By /s/Cruz Rocha_____ Carl L. Fessenden 20 Cruz Rocha Attorneys
for Defendants 21 22 Dated: March 3, 2025 Respectfully Submitted, 23

BRAUNHAGEY & BORDEN LLP

24 By: _/s/Kevin Opoku-Gyamfi (Authorized on 2/21/25)_ 25 Matthew Borden 26 Kevin Opoku-
Gyamfi Attorneys for Plaintiff 27 28 1 || Dated: March 3, 2025 DISABILITY LAW UNITED 2
By: _/s/Cynthia Rice (Authorized on 2/21/25) Cynthia L. Rice 3 Attorney for Plaintiff 4 5 Dated:
March 3, 2025

NATIONAL POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT

6 By: _/s/Eliana Machefsky(Authorized on 2/21/25) _ 7 Keisha James 8 Eliana Machefsky
Attorney for Plaintiff 9 10 1]

[PROPOSED] ORDER

12 Pursuant to the Parties' stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED. 13 14 DATED: March 3, 2025 15 16
17 SEAN C. RIORDAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 11

[PROPOSED] STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER RE: PERSONNEL FILES

1 EXHIBIT A

2 ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND AGREEMENT TO BE BOUND

3 I, _____ [print or type full name], of _____ [print
or 4 type full address], declare under penalty of perjury that I have read in its entirety and
understand the 5 Stipulated Protective Order that was issued by the United States District Court,
Eastern District of 6 California, on [date] in the case of Daher v. County of Sacramento, et al.,
Case No. 2:24-cv-02611-JAM- 7 SCR. I agree to comply with and to be bound by all the terms of
this Stipulated Protective Order and I 8 understand and acknowledge that failure to so comply
could expose me to sanctions and punishment in 9 the nature of contempt. I solemnly promise that
I will not disclose in any manner any information or item 10 that is subject to this Stipulated
Protective Order to any person or entity except in strict compliance with 11 the provisions of this
Order. 12 I further agree to submit to the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Eastern
District of 13 California, for the purpose of enforcing the terms of this Stipulated Protective Order,
even if such 14 enforcement proceedings occur after termination of this action. 15 I hereby appoint
_____ [print or type full name] of 16
_____ [print or type full address and telephone number]
as my 17 California agent for service of process in connection with this action or any proceedings
related to 18 enforcement of this Stipulated Protective Order. 19 20 Date:
_____ 21 City and State where sworn and signed:

_____ 22 23 Printed name:
_____ 24 25 Signature: _____
26 27 28

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/daher-v-county-of-sacramento-wx0mx6a8>