

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Victor Diaz, an individual; and Jesus Rojas, an individual v. The City
of Los Angeles; Alfredo Castillo, an individual; Juan Diaz, an
individual; and Does 1-60

Diaz v. City of Los Angeles · No. 25-cv-10233-FLA (PVCx) · Decided January 23, 2026

SUMMARY

This document is a stipulated protective order in a federal civil rights action brought by Victor Diaz and Jesus Rojas against the City of Los Angeles and individual defendants. It establishes procedures for designating, using, challenging, disclosing, and ultimately handling confidential discovery materials, including law-enforcement records, personnel files, medical records, and other sensitive information.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Pedro V. Castilo
DECIDED	January 23, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-10233-FLA (PVCx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The parties stipulated to and jointly requested entry of a protective order governing confidential discovery material in this civil-rights action.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Victor Diaz, Jesus Rojas v. The City of Los Angeles, Alfredo Castillo, Juan Diaz, Does 1-60

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- civil rights
- municipal law
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights
- municipal law
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause supported entry of the parties' stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material.
2. Whether the protective order should clarify that designation of discovery material as confidential does not itself authorize filing that material under seal.
3. What procedures and restrictions should govern designation, disclosure, challenge, use, and disposition of protected material.

HOLDINGS

1. The court found good cause and entered the stipulated protective order governing confidential discovery material in the action.
2. A designation of discovery material as confidential does not itself authorize filing the material under seal; a party must comply with Civil Local Rule 79-5 and obtain a court order authorizing sealing of the specific material.
3. Protected material may be used only for prosecuting, defending, or attempting to settle the action and may be disclosed only to the categories of persons and under the conditions specified in the protective order.
4. Violations of the protective order may be addressed through appropriate measures, including contempt proceedings and monetary sanctions.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The parties acknowledge that this Stipulated Protective 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)

“However, the entry of a Protective Order by the Court pursuant to this Stipulation shall not be construed as any ruling by the Court on the aforementioned legal statements or privilege claims in this section.” (at 1)

“The parties’ mere designation of Disclosure or Discovery Material as CONFIDENTIAL does not—without the submission of competent evidence by declaration, establishing that the material sought to be filed under seal qualifies as confidential, privileged, or otherwise protectable—constitute good cause.” (at 1-2)

“FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN BY THE PARTIES’ STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.” (at 16)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs sought discovery from the City of Los Angeles and Los Angeles Police Department-related materials concerning the incident underlying the action, including officer personnel files, Internal Affairs materials, recordings, photographs, Force Investigation Division materials, law-enforcement reports, and criminal records concerning nonparties. The City asserted that some materials were confidential and required protection from public disclosure and use outside the litigation. The parties also anticipated that defendants might seek plaintiffs'

sensitive medical records. The parties agreed that a protective order would facilitate discovery while preserving confidentiality interests.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the United States District Court for the Central District of California. The parties submitted a stipulated protective order addressing confidential discovery, challenges to confidentiality designations, access and use restrictions, filing under seal, and post-litigation handling. The court entered the order for good cause shown by the parties' stipulation on January 23, 2026.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kerr v. United States Dist. Ct. for N.D. Cal., 511 F.2d 192, 198 (9th Cir. 1975), aff'd, 426 U.S. 394 (1976)
- Wooden v. Comprehensive Health Mgmt., No. 20-00053 LEK-WRP, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 101889, at *3 (D. Haw. May 28, 2021)
- Pratt v. Gamboa, No. 17-CV-04375-LHK, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 90913, at *5 (N.D. Cal. May 22, 2020)
- Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1176, 1180-81 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp., 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Makar-Welbon v. Sony Electronics, Inc., 187 F.R.D. 576, 577 (E.D. Wis. 1999)
- Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass'n, 605 F.3d 665, 677-79 (9th Cir. 2010)