

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 12-cv-02393-MSK-MEH

MALIBU MEDIA, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOES 1-16,

Defendants.

---

**MINUTE ORDER**

---

**Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on November 29, 2012.**

Pending before the Court is Doe #8's Motion to Quash and/or Dismiss/Nonjoinder Defendants [filed November 26, 2012; docket #14].

At the outset, the Court observes that Doe #8 has failed to seek permission from the Court to proceed anonymously. *See K-Beech, Inc. v. Does 1-29*, 826 F. Supp. 2d 903, 905 (W.D.N.C. 2011) (noting that a party who wishes to proceed anonymously may overcome the presumption against anonymous proceedings by filing a well-reasoned motion to proceed anonymously); *see also West Coast Prods., Inc. v. Does 1-5829*, 275 F.R.D. 9, 12 (D.D.C. 2011) (“federal courts generally allow parties to proceed anonymously only under certain special circumstances when anonymity is necessary to protect a person from harassment, injury, ridicule or personal embarrassment”).

With respect to the remainder of the motion, due to its varied requests for relief, adjudication of the single motion will likely require different standards of review and legal analyses of both dispositive and non-dispositive issues. In the interests of judicial efficiency and the proper management of its docket, the Court **denies** the motion **without prejudice** and instructs Doe #8 to file his remaining requests for relief each in separate motions, as applicable. *See* D.C. Colo. LCivR 7.1C (“A motion shall be made in a separate paper.”) If Doe #8 wishes to re-file his motions in accordance with this order and all applicable local and federal court rules, he must first (or contemporaneously) file a motion to proceed anonymously. The Court warns the parties that it may strike any motion or other filing that deviates from the requirements of this order or from those set forth in the applicable local or federal rules.