Morgan E. Pietz (SBN 260629) THE PIETZ LAW FIRM 3770 Highland Ave., Ste. 206 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266 mpietz@pietzlawfirm.com Telephone: (310) 424-5557 Facsimile: (310) 546-5301 Attorney for: Multiple Putative John Does¹ UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA MALIBU MEDIA, LLC, a California limited Case Number(s): [Multiple; see below] liability company, 10 CORRECTED Plaintiff, JOHN DOES' NOTICE OF MOTION 11 AND MOTION FOR SEVERANCE OF V. ALL DOES OTHER THAN DOE NO. 1 12 JOHN DOES 1 through 8, 13 3:12-cv-1054-LAB-WMC Defendants. 14 Assigned to: Judge Larry Alan Burns 15 Referred to: Magistrate Judge William McCurine, Jr. 16 Hearing Date: November 19, 2012 17 Hearing Time: 11:30 a.m. Hearing Court: Courtroom 9, 2nd Floor 18 Before Judge Burns 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 An identical copy of this pleading has been filed in each case indicated on this caption. A 28 corrected list of clients appears on the signature block, below.

1	MALIBU MEDIA, LLC, a California limited liability company,	3:12-cv-1135-LAB-DHB
3	Plaintiff,	Assigned to: Judge Larry Alan Burns Referred to: Magistrate Judge David H. Bartick
4	V.	Hearing Date: November 19, 2012
5	JOHN DOES 1 through 35,	Hearing Time: 11:30 a.m. Hearing Court: Courtroom 9, 2 nd Floor Before Judge Burns
7	Defendants.	Defore Judge Burns
8	MALIBU MEDIA, LLC, a California limited liability company,	3:12-cv-1354-LAB-WVG
9	Plaintiff,	Assigned to: Judge Larry Alan Burns Referred to: Magistrate Judge William V. Gallo
10 11	V. JOHN DOES 1 through 5,	Hearing Date: November 19, 2012 Hearing Time: 11:30 a.m.
12	-	Hearing Court: Courtroom 9, 2 nd Floor Before Judge Burns
13	Defendants.	Before stage Burns
14	MALIBU MEDIA, LLC, a California limited	3:12-cv-1356-LAB-DHB
15	liability company,	Assigned to: Judge Larry Alan Burns
16	Plaintiff,	Referred to: Magistrate Judge David H. Bartick
17	V.	Hearing Date: TBD
18	JOHN DOES 1 through 27,	Hearing Date: November 19, 2012
19	Defendants.	Hearing Time: 11:30 a.m. Hearing Court: Courtroom 9, 2 nd Floor
20		Before Judge Burns
21 22	MALIBU MEDIA, LLC, a California limited liability company,	3:2012-cv-1370-AJB-JMA
23	Plaintiff,	Assigned to: Judge Anthony J. Battaglia Referred to: Magistrate Judge Jan M. Adler
24	V.	
25	JOHN DOE et al.,	Hearing Date: TBD
26		[Possible transfer pending to Judge Burns]
27	Defendants.	
28		
	-ii-	

NOTICE OF MOTION

TO THE HONORABLE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR COUNSEL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the putative John Does represented by the undersigned, all of whom have previously received letters indicating that Malibu Media has sought to subpoena their identities from their ISPs ("**Moving Parties**"), by and through counsel, hereby move that the Court:

- (1) Sever all of the John Does, other than John Does No. 1 from the instant action, and from all related actions pending in this District, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 21. The Court should decide the permissive joinder issue now, sever all of the Does other than Doe No. 1, and dismiss the claims against the other Does without prejudice, on the following grounds:
- (A) Defendants merely "committed the same type of violations in the same way" which is not enough to satisfy the transactional relatedness test. *E.g., Digital Sins, Inc. v. John Does 1-245*, S.D.N.Y. Case No. 11-cv-8170, Dkt. No. 18, 5/15/12, p. 3.
- (B) Plaintiff's complaints allege that John Does accessed files on BitTorrent *months apart from one another*, and that plaintiffs who were supposed to be in the "same swarm" actually downloaded *different movies*. Thus, plaintiffs are not really part of the "same swarm," and therefore the downloads are not part of the same "transaction or occurrence." *E.g., Malibu Media v. John Does 1-10*, C.D. Cal. Case No. 12-cv-3623-ODW-PJW, docket no. 7, 6/27/12, p. 5.
- (C) There are different "questions of law or fact" between the different Does in the same cases, because Does in the same action are alleged to have downloaded different copyrighted works, and each Doe has different factual scenarios and legal defenses, *see* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 20(a)(2)(B).
- (D) Even if joinder were permissible, the Court should still exercise its discretion and sever the Does in light of plaintiff's "abusive litigation tactics" and the burden on the Courts, the ISPs and the Does. *See Acevedo v. Allsup's Convenience Stores, Inc.*, 600 F.3d 516, 521-522 (5th Cir. 2010).

Further, the Moving Parties request that the Court quash all outstanding subpoenas for all Does that it severs, per Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 45(c)(3). *In re: BitTorrent Adult Film Copyright Infringement Cases*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61447 (E.D.N.Y. May 1, 2012) Case No. CV-11-3995-DRH-GRB, Dkt. No. 39, pp. 23-25; *Digital Sins, Inc. v. John Does 1-245*, S.D.N.Y. Case No. 11-cv-8170, Dkt. No. 18, 5/15/12, p. 7 ("Because I have severed and dismissed all of the claims against the defendants, I hereby, *sua sponte*, quash any subpoena that may be outstanding to any Internet service provider seeking information about the identity of any John Doe other than John Doe 1. Plaintiff is directed to send a copy of this order within 24 hours of its issuance to any and every internet service provider who has been served with a subpoena for any information concerning any other John Doe defendant.").

Moving Parties rely on this Notice of Motion, the concurrently filed Memorandum of Points and Authorities; the Declaration of Morgan E. Pietz and supporting Exhibits, Appendices 1 and 2, which are copies of PACER docket report for various Malibu Media cases; the pleadings and records on file herein; and on such further evidence as the Court may admit at any hearing on this matter, if any.

Case 3:12-cv-01054-LAB-DHB Document 9 Filed 09/18/12 Page 6 of 6