UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

```
)
VOLTAGE PICTURES, LLC )
)
Plaintiffs, )
) CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:10-cv-00873-RMU v. )
)
DOES 1-5,000)
)
Defendants. )
```

MOTION OF NONPARTIES TO QUASH SUBPOENA

Nonparty Margaret Wenzek hereby respectfully request that this Court quash the subpoena purportedly served upon Bresnan Communications, LLC, or in the alternative declare that no valid subpoena has properly been served upon the Margaret Wenzek pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 45.

As grounds therefore, Margaret Wenzek state as follows:

- 1. Margaret Wenzek lives in the state of Montana. Margaret Wenzek is not located within, or operates any business within, the District of Columbia or within 100 miles of this Court.
- 2. On or about October 4, 2010, plaintiff Voltage Pictures LLC, through counsel, purported to serve on Bresnan Communications a subpoena by mail, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 3. The purported subpoena does not set forth a place for responding thereto that is within 100 miles of the residence or place of business of Margaret Wenzek as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(3)(B)(iii).
- 4. Finally, and most importantly, the purported subpoena would require that Bresnan Communications disclose to plaintiffs a list of persons who have downloaded certain content or information of public interest, on a matter of ongoing intense political debate, despite these persons' privacy interest in avoiding such disclosure and despite their legitimate expectation of privacy in anonymously accessing and/or downloading information of interest to them from the Internet. In addition to being unduly burdensome and unfair to Margaret Wenzek, this request raises concerns of tremendous constitutional significance, that should not be resolved lightly or without careful analysis of their implications. The Supreme Court has repeatedly reaffirmed the constitutional right to speak anonymously, see, e.g., MacIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission, 514 U.S. 334, 342 (1995), and at least one court has recognized the importance of protecting



DCT 2 9 2010

anonymous speech in the Internet context. See ACLU v. Miller, 977 F. Supp. 1228, 1231 (N.D. Ga. 1997).

Conclusion

The subpoena must be quashed because it has not been properly served, because it violates the geographic limitations of Rule 45, and because it impose an undue burden on Bresnan Communications and Margaret Wenzek that raises significant constitutional questions. More fundamentally, they must be dismissed because they are in aid of an underlying case that itself must be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, lack of personal jurisdiction, and mootness. It is improper to impose on a third party the burden of any subpoena — particularly one that raises a host of thorny privacy issues — in aid of a case that does not belong in this Court in the first place.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGARET WENZEK

3626 5th Ave. So. Great Falls, MT 59405

Dated: October 27, 2010

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on October 27, 2010, I caused true copies of the above document to be sent to counsel for Plaintiffs, by USPS.

Margaret Wenzek

AO 88B (Rev. 05/09) Subpoena to Produce Documents, Information, or Objects or to Permit Inspection of Premises in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

District of	Columbia
OR TO PERMIT INSPECTION OF To: Bresnan Communications, LLC, Attn: Custodian of R Fax: 914-641-3435 **Production: YOU ARE COMMANDED to production:	ce at the time, date, and place set forth below the following d permit their inspection, copying, testing, or sampling of the
	esses of all individuals whose IP addresses are listed in the Date and Time:
	Deep to permit entry onto the designated premises, land, or ate, and location set forth below, so that the requesting party the property or any designated object or operation on it. Date and Time:
45 (d) and (e), relating to your duty to respond to this subposition attached.	your protection as a person subject to a subpoena, and Rule sena and the potential consequences of not doing so, are
Date: 09/21/2010 CLERK OF COURT Signature of Clerk or Deputy Cle	OR Attorney's signature
The name, address, e-mail, and telephone number of the atto /oltage Pictures, LLC Nicholas A. Kurtz, Dunlap, Grubb & Weaver, PLLC, 1200 G Tel. 877-223-7212, Fax: 866-874-5101, email: subpoena@	orney representing (name of party) Plaintiff , who issues or requests this subpoena, are: Street, NW Suite 800, Washington, DC 20005