

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential case-specific stipulated protective order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)

