

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Northern District of California

PATRICK COLLINS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
DOES 1-2,590,
Defendants.

No. C 11-2766 MEJ

**ORDER STRIKING MOTION TO
QUASH/DISMISS (DOE DEFENDANT
1085, IP ADDRESS 68.197.57.82)**

Re: Docket No. 37

On November 16, 2011, an anonymous defendant noticed a motion to quash and/or dismiss the complaint, which names only Doe defendants. Dkt. No. 37. The litigant identifies himself or herself only as “Doe Defendant 1085,” at IP Address 68.197.57.82. Because the Doe 1085 has disclosed no identifying information, there is no way to determine whether the motion was filed by a real party in interest or a stranger to the litigation. As such, the filing is improper. The Clerk of Court shall STRIKE Dkt. No. 37. If Doe 1085 wishes to appear in this action anonymously or otherwise, he or she must follow the proper procedures for doing so. At a minimum, the Court and the parties must be informed of the litigant’s identity. If the litigant wishes to protect his or her identity from the public, the litigant may use a pseudonym in public filings only after receiving permission for good cause shown. Defendant is advised that the Ninth Circuit court of appeals allows the use of pseudonyms only in the most unusual cases. *See, e.g., Does I thru XXIII v. Advanced Textile Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1058, 1067–68 (9th Cir. 2000).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 17, 2011



Maria-Elena James
Chief United States Magistrate Judge