

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

MICHAEL ZUKOWSKI, :
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 v. : CASE NO. 3:04CV1174 (RNC)
 :
 F. DELBUONO et al., :
 :
 Defendants. :

RULING

After the case terminated, the pro se plaintiff filed the instant motion for protective order.¹ (Doc. #29.) The plaintiff seeks an order that his deposition, which is not on file with the court, be sealed, including the transcript in possession of the court reporter. As grounds for his request, plaintiff states that the protective order is needed to protect him from physical harm, undue oppression and embarrassment. Plaintiff also suggests that the order is needed to protect an ongoing investigation.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(6) provides that a court may order that a deposition may be sealed and opened only by order of the court. Rule 26(c) requires a showing of good cause for a protective order. "This puts the burden on the party seeking relief to show some plainly adequate reason therefor. The courts have insisted on a particular and specific demonstration of fact, as distinguished from stereotyped and conclusory statements, in order to establish

¹The motion is unopposed.

good cause." Hawley v. Hall 131 F.R.D. 578, 583 (D. Nev. 1990). The plaintiff, as the party seeking protection from disclosure, "has the burden of making a particular and specific demonstration of fact, as distinguished from general, conclusory statements, revealing some injustice, prejudice, or consequential harm that will result if protection is denied." Blum v. Schlegel, 150 F.R.D. 38, 41 (W.D.N.Y. 1993). The plaintiff has not met that burden.

Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion is denied without prejudice to refiling upon a showing of good cause.

SO ORDERED at Hartford, Connecticut this 5th day of July, 2007.

_____/s/_____
Donna F. Martinez
United States Magistrate Judge