

1 Adam M. Silverstein (197638)  
 2 CAVALLUZZI & CAVALLUZZI  
 3 9200 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 807  
 4 Los Angeles, California 90069  
 5 Telephone: (310) 246-2601  
 6 Facsimile: (310) 246-2606  
 7 Email: adam@cavalluzzi.com  
 8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

9  
 10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11  
 12 MALIBU MEDIA, LLC,  
 a California corporation,

Case No.

13  
 14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 JOHN DOES 1-25,

17  
 18 Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR  
 LEAVE TO SERVE THIRD PARTY  
 SUBPOENAS PRIOR TO A RULE  
 26(f) CONFERENCE AND  
 INCORPORATED  
MEMORANDUM OF LAW**

19  
 20 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1), Plaintiff, Malibu Media, LLC, moves for  
 21 entry of an order granting it leave to serve third party subpoenas prior to a Rule 26(f)  
 22 conference (the "Motion"), and submits the following memorandum in support.

23  
 24 **I. INTRODUCTION**

25 Plaintiff seeks leave to serve limited, immediate discovery on the Doe  
 26 Defendants' Internet Service Providers ("ISPs") so that Plaintiff may learn  
 27  
 28

1 Defendants' true identities. Plaintiff is suing each of the Defendants for using the  
2 Internet and the BitTorrent protocol to commit direct and contributory copyright  
3 infringement.  
4

5 Since Defendants used the Internet to commit their infringement, Plaintiff only  
6 knows Defendants by their Internet Protocol ("IP") addresses. Defendants' IP  
7 addresses were assigned to the Defendants by their respective Internet Service  
8 Providers ("ISPs"). Accordingly, the ISPs can use the IP addresses to identify the  
9 Defendants. Indeed, ISPs maintain internal logs which record the date, time and  
10 customer identity for each IP address assignment made by that ISP. Significantly, the  
11 ISPs may maintain these logs for only a short period of time.  
12

13  
14 Plaintiff seeks leave of Court to serve a Rule 45 subpoena on the ISPs and any  
15 related intermediary ISPs. Any such subpoena will demand the true name, address,  
16 telephone number, e-mail address and Media Access Control ("MAC") address of  
17 the Defendant to whom the ISP issued an IP address.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff will only use this  
18 information to prosecute the claims made in its Complaint. Without this information,  
19 Plaintiff cannot serve the Defendants nor pursue this lawsuit to protect its valuable  
20 copyrights.  
21  
22

## 23 **II. ARGUMENT**

24  
25 Pursuant to Rule 26(d)(1), except for circumstances not applicable here, absent  
26 a court order, a party may not propound discovery in advance of a Rule 26(f)

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> A MAC address is a number that identifies the specific computer used for the infringing activity.

1 conference. Rule 26(b) provides courts with the authority to issue such an order:  
2 “[f]or good cause, the court may order discovery of any matter relevant to the subject  
3 matter involved in the action.” “In Internet infringement cases, courts routinely find  
4 good cause exists to issue a Rule 45 subpoena to discover a Doe defendant’s identity,  
5 prior to a Rule 26(f) conference, where a plaintiff makes: (1) a prima facie showing  
6 of infringement, (2) there is no other way to identify the Doe Defendant, and (3)  
7 there is a risk an ISP will destroy its logs prior to the conference.” UMG Recording,  
8 Inc. v. Doe, 2008 WL 4104214, \*4 (N.D. Cal. 2008) (numbers added). See also,  
9 Arista Records LLC v. Does 1-19, 551 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6-7 (D.D.C. 2008), and the  
10 cases cited therein, noting the “overwhelming” number of cases where copyright  
11 infringement plaintiffs sought to identify “Doe” defendants and courts “routinely  
12 applied” the good cause standard to permit discovery. Some other courts, in the  
13 context of a defendant’s First Amendment right to privacy, also require Plaintiff to:  
14 (4) specify the discovery requested, (5) demonstrate a central need for the  
15 subpoenaed information to advance the asserted claims, and (6) establish that the  
16 party’s expectation of privacy does not outweigh the need for the requested  
17 discovery. See Sony Music Entertainment v. Does 1-40, 326 F.Supp. 556, 564-565  
18 (S.D.N.Y. 2004). Here, Plaintiff easily satisfies all of these requirements.  
19 Accordingly, this Court should grant the Motion.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           **A.     Circuit Courts Unanimously Permit Discovery to Identify John Doe**  
2           **Defendants**

3           Federal Circuit Courts have unanimously approved the procedure of suing  
4 John Doe defendants and then using discovery to identify such defendants. For  
5 example, the First Circuit held in Penalbert-Rosa v. Fortuno-Burset, 631 F.3d 592  
6 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 2011) that “[a] plaintiff who is unaware of the identity of the person who  
7 wronged her can . . . proceed against a ‘John Doe’ . . . when discovery is likely to  
8 reveal the identity of the correct defendant.” See also David v. Kelly, 160 F.3d 917,  
9 921 (2d Cir. 1998) (“Courts have rejected the dismissal of suits against unnamed  
10 defendants . . . until the plaintiff has had some opportunity for discovery to learn the  
11 identities.”). Accord Blakeslee v. Clinton County, 336 Fed.Appx. 248, 250 (3d Cir.  
12 2009); Chidi Njoku v. Unknown Special Unit Staff; 217 F.3d 840 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000);  
13 Green v. Doe, 260 Fed.Appx. 717, 719 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); Brown v. Owens Corning Inv.  
14 Review Committee, 622 F.3d 564, 572 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2010); Maclin v. Paulson, 627 F.2d  
15 83, 87 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980); Munz v. Parr, 758 F.2d 1254, 1257 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1985); Young v.  
16 Transportation Deputy Sheriff I, 340 Fed Appx. 368 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009); Krueger v. Doe,  
17 162 F.3d 1173, (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1998); Dean v. Barber, 951 F.2d 1210, 1215 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
18 1992).

19           **B.     Good Cause Exists to Grant the Motion**

20           **1.     Plaintiff Properly Pled Copyright Infringement**

21           Plaintiff satisfied the first good cause factor by properly pleading a cause of  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 action for copyright infringement:

2 48. Plaintiff is the owner of the copyrights for the Works, each of  
3 which contains an original work of authorship.

4 49. By using the BitTorrent protocol and a BitTorrent Client and the  
5 processes described above, each Defendant copied the constituent  
6 elements of the Works that are original.

7 50. Plaintiff did not authorize, permit or consent to Defendants'  
8 copying of its Works.

9 Complaint at ¶¶ 48-50. See 17 U.S.C. §106; In re Aimster Copyright Litig., 334 F.3d  
10 643, 645 (7th Cir. 2003), cert. denied, 124 S. Ct. 1069 (2004) (“Teenagers and young  
11 adults who have access to the Internet like to swap computer files containing popular  
12 music. If the music is copyrighted, such swapping, which involves making and  
13 transmitting a digital copy of the music, infringes copyright.”). Further, Plaintiff’s  
14 allegations of infringement are attested to by Plaintiff’s investigator, IPP, Limited’s  
15 employee, Tobias Fieser. See Declaration of Tobias Fieser in Support of Plaintiff’s  
16 Motion for Leave to Take Discovery Prior to a Rule 26(f) Conference (“Fieser  
17 Declaration”) at ¶¶ 18 and 22, Exhibit A. Accordingly, Plaintiff has exceeded its  
18 obligation to plead a prima facie case.  
19  
20  
21

22 **2. There Is No Other Way To Obtain Defendants’ True**  
23 **Identities**

24 Other than by getting the information from the Defendants’ ISPs, there is no  
25 other way to obtain Defendants’ true identities because “[o]nly the ISP to whom a  
26 particular IP address has been assigned for use by its subscribers can correlate the IP  
27  
28

1 address to a real person, the subscriber of the internet service.” Fieser Declaration at  
2 ¶ 9. Indeed, “[o]nce provided with the IP address, plus the date and time of the  
3 detected and documented infringing activity, ISPs can use their subscriber logs to  
4 identify the name, address, email address, phone number and Media Access Control  
5 number of the subscriber” [i.e., the Defendant]. Fieser Declaration at ¶ 23. Since  
6 there is no other way for Plaintiff to obtain Defendants’ identities, except by serving  
7 a subpoena on Defendants’ ISPs demanding it, Plaintiff has established the second  
8 good cause factor. See Seescandy.com, 185 F.R.D. 573, 578-80 (N.D. Cal. 1999).

11 **3. There Is A Risk That An ISP Will Destroy Its Logs Prior To**  
12 **The Rule 26(f) Conference**

13 Logically, it is not possible for Plaintiffs to have a 26(f) conference with the  
14 Defendants until Plaintiff learns their identities. Therefore, since “[m]any ISPs only  
15 retain the information sufficient to correlate an IP address to a person at a given time  
16 for a very limited amount of time,” see Fieser Declaration at ¶ 11, it is an absolute  
17 certainty, unless this Motion granted, that the identifying records will be destroyed in  
18 advance of the 26(f) conference. Further, unless action is taken quickly, the ISPs’  
19 records may be deleted or destroyed and Plaintiff’s right to sue Defendants for  
20 infringement may be forever lost. Since the identifying records will undoubtedly be  
21 destroyed before a 26(f) conference, which cannot occur until Plaintiff obtains  
22 Defendants’ identities from their ISPs, Plaintiff has satisfied the third good cause  
23 factor. UMG, 2008 WL 4104214, \*5.

1                   **4. Plaintiff Has Clearly Identified The Information Sought**  
2                   **Through Discovery**

3                   Plaintiff seeks to discover from the Defendants' ISPs the true name, address,  
4 telephone number, e-mail address and Media Access Control ("MAC") address of  
5 the Defendants. This is all specific information that is in the possession of the  
6 Defendants' ISPs. Since the requested discovery is limited and specific, Plaintiff has  
7 satisfied the fourth good cause factor. Sony, 326 F. Supp. At 566.

9                   **5. Plaintiff Needs The Subpoenaed Information To Advance The**  
10                   **Asserted Claims**

11                   Obviously, without learning the Defendants' true identities, Plaintiff will not  
12 be able to serve the Defendants with process and proceed with this case. Plaintiff's  
13 important statutorily protected property rights are at issue in this suit and, therefore,  
14 the equities should weigh heavily in favor of preserving Plaintiff's rights. Since  
15 identifying the Defendants by name is necessary for Plaintiff to advance the asserted  
16 claims, Plaintiff has established the fifth good cause faith factor. Id.

19                   **6. Plaintiffs' Interest in Knowing Defendants' True Identities**  
20                   **Outweighs Defendants' Interests in Remaining Anonymous**

21                   Plaintiff has a strong legitimate interest in protecting its copyrights.  
22 Defendants are all copyright infringers that have no legitimate expectation of privacy  
23 in the subscriber information they provided to the ISPs, much less in distributing the  
24 copyrighted work in question without permission. See Interscope Records v. Does 1-  
25 14, 558 F.Supp.2d 1176, 1178 (D. Kan. 2008) (a person using the Internet to  
26  
27  
28

1 distribute or download copyrighted music without authorization is not entitled to  
2 have their identity protected from disclosure under the First Amendment); Guest v.  
3 Leis, 255 F.3d 325, 336 (6th Cir. 2001) (“computer users do not have a legitimate  
4 expectation of privacy in their subscriber information because they have conveyed it  
5 to another person—the system operator”); and Sony Music Entertainment, Inc. v.  
6 Does 1–40, 326 F.Supp.2d 556, 566 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (“defendants have little  
7 expectation of privacy in downloading and distributing copyrighted songs without  
8 permission.”) Since Defendants do not have a legitimate interest in remaining  
9 anonymous and Plaintiff has a strong, statutorily recognized and protected interest in  
10 protecting its copyrights, Plaintiff has established the sixth good cause faith factor.

### 14 **III. CONCLUSION**

15 For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant leave to Plaintiff to issue  
16 Rule 45 subpoenas to the Defendants’ ISPs. A proposed order is attached as Exhibit  
17 B.

18  
19 Respectfully submitted,

20  
21 By: /s/ Adam M. Silverstein  
22 Adam M. Silverstein (197638)  
23 CAVALLUZZI & CAVALLUZZI  
24 9200 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 807  
25 Los Angeles, California 90069  
26 Telephone: (310) 246-2601  
27 Facsimile: (310) 246-2606  
28 Email: adam@cavalluzzi.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*