

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NEW SENSATIONS, INC., a California
corporation,

No. C 10-05863 WHA

Plaintiff,

**ORDER STRIKING
MOTION TO DISMISS**

v.

DOES 1-1745,


Defendants.

On June 22, 2011, an anonymous defendant noticed a motion to dismiss the complaint, which names only Doe defendants. The litigant identifies himself or herself only as “Defendant Doe #733.” Because “Defendant Doe #733” 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 shall **STRIKE** Dkt. Nos. 25 and 13.

If “Defendant Doe #333” 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. Counsel are 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: June 23, 2011.


WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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