

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

PATRICK COLLINS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOES 1-21,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:11-cv-15232-DPH-MAR

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN
WHICH IT HAS TO EFFECTUATE SERVICE ON DOE DEFENDANT**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m), Plaintiff, Patrick Collins, Inc., moves for entry of an order extending the time within which to effectuate service on Doe Defendant, and states:

1. This is a copyright case against Doe Defendants known to Plaintiff only by an IP address. The true identities of the Doe Defendants are known by their respective Internet service providers ("ISPs").

2. On or about December 20, 2011, Plaintiff perfected service of the subpoenas on the ISPs, demanding that they produce the identities of the unknown Doe Defendants. The responses to the subpoenas were due on February 2, 2012.

3. On January 26, 2012, John Doe 18 filed a Motion to Quash [Dkt. #6].

4. On April 5, 2012, Magistrate Judge Randon issued a Report and Recommendation to Deny John Doe 18's Motion to Quash Subpoena and Dismiss [Dkt. #13].

5. Plaintiff has not been able to obtain the identity of John Doe 18, as Judge Randon's Report and Recommendation has not yet been adopted by Judge Hood.

6. John Doe 18 is the last remaining defendant in the case.

7. Pursuant to this Court's order dated April 19, 2012, Plaintiff has until today, June 27, 2012, to serve Defendants with a summons and Complaint. Plaintiff is unable to comply with this deadline as it does not have the identifying information for defendant.

8. Procedurally, Plaintiff respectfully requests an extension of thirty (30) days after the Court's ruling on the pending motion to serve Defendant John Doe 18. Such extension will allow Plaintiff sufficient time to obtain the identity of the Defendant, should the Court rule in Plaintiff's favor, and allow for Plaintiff to amend its complaint and file summonses with the Court in order to properly serve Defendant with a summons and Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the time within which it has to effectuate service of the summons and Complaint on each Defendant be extended until thirty (30) days after this Court's ruling on the pending Motion to Quash. A proposed order is attached for the Court's convenience.

Dated: June 27, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John S. Hone

John S. Hone
Michigan Bar No. P36253
Attorney for Plaintiff
The Hone Law Firm, P.C.
28411 Northwestern Hwy., Ste. 960
Southfield, Michigan 48034
P: (248) 948-9800
F: (248) 948-9811
jhone@honefirm.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 27, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF and that service was perfected on all counsel of record and interested parties through this system.

/s/ John S. Hone

John S. Hone

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to MI R USDCTED LR 5.1(a) I hereby certify that this PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH IT HAS TO EFFECTUATE SERVICE ON DOE DEFENDANTS has been prepared using one of the font and point selections approved by the Court in MI R USDCTED LR 5.1(a)(3). This document was prepared using Times New Roman (12 pt.).

Dated: June 27, 2012

/s/ John S. Hone

John S. Hone