

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....1

II. Facts2

 A. Plaintiff Has a Serious Problem with Online Infringement 2-3

 B. The Executive Branch, Congress, Federal Courts and Copyright Owners are all Very Concerned with the Jobs and Money Lost From Online Piracy 3-4

 C. The Internet Creates a Unique Moral Hazard for File Sharers 4-5

 D. Professional Digital Pirates Thumb their Noses at Copyright Owners..... 5-6

 E. Plaintiff’s Copyright Enforcement Campaign is Necessary and Proper..... 6-7

 F. Peer-to-Peer Copyright Suits Have Several Unique Characteristics that Weight Heavily in Favor of Finding That Joinder is Proper Prior to Discovery..... 7-11

 i. Plaintiff Proceeds Against Unknown John Doe Defendants that it May Not Want to Sue.....7

 ii. Absent Joinder, Data Retention Issues Will Cause Plaintiff To Sue John Does That Cannot Be Identified.....7

 iii. Absent Joinder, The Dynamic IP Address Issue Will Cause Plaintiff to Sue The Same Defendants Twice8

 iv. Public Policy Encourages Early Settlements and Plaintiff’s Demands Are Consistent With Decisional Authority 9-10

 v. Joinder is Required By Rule 1’s Instruction To Judges to Construe The Rules to Secure the Inexpensive Determination to Every Action.....10

 vi. File Sharers Don’t Want to Be Sued Individually – They Dream of “Crippling the Process” Through Templated Motions to Quash11

 vii. Courts Hold That Suing The Doe Defendants Individually Is NOT in the Doe Defendants’ Best Interest.....11

II. ARGUMENT12

 A. LEGAL STANDARD..... 12-14

 B. The Way BitTorrent Works, Infringers Continue To Distribute Files Indefinitely14

 C. Same Swarm BitTorrent Infringement is Logically Related 14-15

 D. Doe Defendants Distributed The Same Exact Torrent File As Evidenced by Cryptographic Alphanumeric Hash Value..... 15-16

IV. LEGAL ARGUMENT16

 A. The District of Columbia Correctly Supports Joinder In BitTorrent Cases..... 16-17

 B. Joinder is Proper Because Defendants’ Infringement Was Part of a Series of Transactions 17-18

- 1. Here, Plaintiff Properly Pled a Series of Transactions 18-19
- C. There are Common Issues of Fact and Law.....19
- D. Joinder Promotes Judicial Efficiency and is Beneficial to Putative Defendant.....19
- E. Doe Defendants Can Raise the Joinder Issue After Discovery.....20
- F. Disallowing Joinder would Effectively Prevent Plaintiff from Being Able to Enforce Its Copyrights and Would Be Inconsistent with Rule 120
- G. All of the Other Districts Courts From the Around the Country Permit Joinder.....20
 - 1. California District Courts Permit Joinder20
 - i. The Eastern District of California Allows Joinder21
 - ii. The Southern District of California Permits Joinder in BitTorrent Cases .21
 - iii. The Northern District of California Permits BitTorrent Cases and Expressly Distinguishes Its Prior Precedent Holding Joinder Was Not Permitted 21-25
 - 2. The Northern District of Illinois Permits Joinder25
 - 3. The Southern District of New York Holds Joinder is Permitted 25-26
- H. Joinder is Also Proper Because Plaintiff Pled That Each of the Defendants is Contributorily Liable for Each Other Defendant’s Infringement 26-27
 - a. Contributory Infringement is a Jury Question27
 - b. Plaintiff intends to Call Each Defendants to Prove Contributory Infringement vis-à-vis the other Defendants..... 27-28
- I. Distinguishable Non-Bit Torrent Cases..... 28-29
- V. Conclusion 29-30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc., 239 F.3d 1004 (2001).4

Accord Hard Drive Productions, Inc. v. Does 1–46, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67314 (N.D. Cal. 2011)22

Adobe Systems, Inc. v. Canus Productions, Inc., 173 F. Supp.2d 1044, 1055 (C.D. Cal. 2001)..27

Allen v. Burke, 690 F. 2d 376 (4th Cir. 1982).....11

Arista Records LLC v. Lime Group LLC, 715 F. Supp. 2d 481 (2010).....4

Berlin Media Art E.K. v. Does 1-144, 2011 WL 4056167 (E.D. CA. 2011)21

BMG Music v. Does 1-203, Case No. 2:04-cv-00650-CN (E.D.P.A. 2004).....28

BMG Music, et.. al. v. Does 1-4, Case No. 3:06-cv-01579-MHP, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53237, (N.D. Cal. 2006),3d 883 (6th Cir. 2004).....28

Boy Racer, Inc. v. Does 1-60, 2011 WL 3652521, (N.D.Cal. 2011)23

Bridgeport Music, inc. v. Diamond Time, Ltd., 371 F.3d 883 (6th Cir. 2004) 27-28

Call of the Wild Movie, LLC v. Smith, No. 10–0455, 2011 WL 1807416, at *9 (D.D.C. May 12, 2011)22

Call of the Wild v. Does 1-331, 274 F.R.D. 334 (D.D.C. 2011)17

Call of the Wild v. Does 1-1062, 770 F.Supp.2d at 332 and 33411, 17, 22

Camelot Distribution Group v. Does 1-1210, 2011 WL 4455249, *3 (E.D.Cal. 2011)21

Capitol v. Thomas, 06-cv-01497, (D.C. MN).....9

Coughlin v. Rogers, 130 F.3d 1348, 1350 (9th Cir.1997)24

Costar Group, Inc. v. Loopnet, Inc., 164 F. Supp.2d 688, 696 (M.D. 2001).....26

DigiProtect USA Corp. v. Does, 2011 WL 4444666 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)25

Disney Enterprises, Inc. v. Delane, 446 F.Supp.2d 402 (D. MD. 2006)6

Donkeyball Movie, LLC v. Does 1-171 (D.D.C. 2011)17

Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 93 (2007).....18

First Time Videos, LLC v. Does 1-76 -- F.R.D. --, 2011 WL 3586245, *4 (N.D.Ill.,2011) ...1, 25

First Time Videos, LLC v. Does 1-500, -- F.Supp.2d --, 2011 WL 3498227 N.D.Ill.,2011) (Conlon, J.).....25

Future Blue, Inc. v. Does 1–300, 10 C 6256 (N.D. Ill. June 8, 2011)(Conlon, J.)25

Goldberg v. Cameron, 2009 WL 2051370, 6 (N.D. Cal. 2009).....28

Interscope Records, et. al. v. Does 1-25, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS, Case No. 6:04-cv-197 – ACC-DAB (M.D. Fla. 2004)28

LaFace Records, LLC v. Does 1-38, 2008 WL 544992 (E.D. N.C. 200824

Liberty Media Holdings, LLC v. Swarm of November 16, 2010, 2011 WL 1597495, *4 (S.D.Cal.2011)5, 21

Lightspeed v. Does 1–1,000, 10 C 5604 (N.D.Ill. Mar. 31, 2011) (Manning, J).....25

Lightspeed v. Does 1–1,000, 2011 U.S. Dist LEXIS 35392 (N.D.Ill. 2011)24

Marobie-FL, Inc. v. National Ass’n of Fire Equipment Distributors, 983 F. Supp. 1167 (N.D. IL 1997)27

Maverick Entertainment Group, Inc. v. Does 1-2115, 2011 WL 1807428 (D.D.C. 2011)17

MCGIP, LLC v. Does 1-149, 2011 WL 4352110, N.D.Cal., September 16, 201123

MCGIP, LLC v. Does 1-149, 2011 WL 3607666, at 3 (N.D.Cal. 2011)22

MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd. 545 U.S. 913 (2005)4

Millenium [sic] TGA Inc. v. Does 1-800, 10 C 5603 (N.D.Ill. Mar. 31, 2011) (Manning, J)25

M.L.E. Music v. Kimble, Inc., 109 F. Supp.2d 469, 474 (S.D. W.Va. 2000)11

Moore v. New York Cotton Exchange, 270 U.S. 593, 610, 46 S.Ct. 367, 371, 70 L.Ed. 750 (1926).....13

Mosley v. Gen. Motors Corp., 497 F.2d 1330, 1332 (8th Cir.1974)13

New Sensations, Inc. v. Does 1-1,474, 2011 WL 4407222, (N.D.Cal. 2011)22

New Sensations, Inc. v. Does 1-1,745, 2011 WL 2837610 (N.D. Cal. 2011)22

NuImage, Inc. v. Does 1-22,322, 2011 WL 3240562 (D.D.C. 2011).....16

On The Cheap, LLC v. Does 1-5011, 2011 WL 4018258, at *1 (N.D.Cal. 2011)21, 23

OpenMind Solutions, Inc. v. Does 1-39, 2011 WL 3740714, (N.D.Cal. 2011)23

Patrick Collins, Inc. v. John Does 1-9, 11-cv-01269 (S.D. N.Y. 2011) (Dkt # 10).....26

Patrick Collins, Inc. v. Does 1-35, 11-cv-00406 (E.D. VA 2011) (Dkt. 15)1

Patrick Collins v. Does 1-2,590, 2011 WL 4407172, *4 (N.D. Cal. 2011).....13, 22, 24

Sony v. Tenenbaum, 03CV11661-NG, (D. Mass).....9

Suntrust Bank v. Houghton, 268 F.3d 1257, 1260-63 (11th Cir. 2001)3

Stinnette v. Medtronic, Inc., 2010 WL 767558 (S.D. TX 2010)13

Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. et. al. v. Does 1-12, Case No. 3:04-cv-04862-WHA, (N.D. Cal. 2004).....28

United Mine Workers of Am. v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715, 724 (1966).....12

Voltage Pictures, LLC v. Does 1-5,000, 79 Fed.R.Serv.3d 891 (D.D.C. 2011)17

Voltage Pictures, LLC v. Does 1-5,000, No. 10-0873, WL 1807438, at *8 (D.D.C. May 12, 2011).23

West v. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co., 1994 WL 399140 at *2 (4th Cir. 1994)9

West Coast Productions, Inc. v. Does 1-5829, 275 F.R.D. 9 (D.D.C. 2011)17