	Case3:11-cv-02766-MEJ Document56 Filed11/29/11 Page1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	Northern District of California
8	
9	PATRICK COLLINS, INC., No. C 11-2766 MEJ
10	Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
11	v. QUASH RE: DOE DEFENDANT #2029
12	DOES 1-2,590, <b>Re: Docket No. 18</b>
13	Defendants.
14	
15	On June 7, 2011, Plaintiff Patrick Collins, Inc. filed this lawsuit against 2,590 Doe
16	Defendants, alleging that Defendants illegally reproduced and distributed a work subject to
17	Plaintiff's exclusive license, ("Real Female Orgasms 10"), using an internet peer-to-peer file sharing
18	network known as BitTorrent, thereby violating the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 101-1322. Compl.
19	¶¶ 6-15, Dkt. No. 1. On September 22, 2011, the Court granted Plaintiff's Application for Leave to
20	Take Limited Expedited Discovery. Dkt. No. 12. The Court permitted Plaintiff to serve subpoenas
21	on Does 1-2,590's Internet Service Providers ("ISPs") by serving a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
22	45 subpoena that seeks information sufficient to identify the Doe Defendants, including the name,
23	address, telephone number, and email address of Does 1-2,590. Id. at 11. Once the ISPs provided
24	Does 1-2,590 with a copy of the subpoena, the Court permitted Does 1-2,590 30 days from the date
25	of service to file any motions contesting the subpoena (including a motion to quash or modify the
26	subpoena). Id.
27	Now before the Court is a Motion to Quash, filed by Doe Defendant #2029, referred to as

27 Now before the Court is a Motion to Quash, filed by Doe Defendant #2029, felered to as
28 "John Doe." Dkt. No. 18. In his motion, John Doe requests that the subpoena be quashed because

## Case3:11-cv-02766-MEJ Document56 Filed11/29/11 Page2 of 2

Plaintiff failed to comply with California Code of Civil Procedure sections 1985 and 1985.3.

However, Plaintiff has responded to John Doe's motion, correctly arguing that the California Code

3 of Civil Procedure applies to California courts, and this Court is governed by the Federal Rules of

Civil Procedure. As John Doe has failed to file any reply, the motion is DENIED.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 29, 2011

Maria-Elena James Chief United States Magistrate Judge