

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

NEW SENSATIONS, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
DOES 1-1,474,  
Defendants.

No. C 11-2770 MEJ  
**ORDER RE DOE DEFENDANT #37's  
MOTION TO DISMISS**  
**Docket No. 22**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On June 7, 2011, Plaintiff New Sensations, Inc. ("Plaintiff") filed this lawsuit against 1,474 Doe Defendants, alleging that Defendants illegally reproduced and distributed a work subject to Plaintiff's exclusive license, ("*Big Bang Theory: A XXX Parody*"), using an internet peer-to-peer file sharing network known as BitTorrent, thereby violating the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 101-1322. Compl. ¶¶ 6-15, Dkt. No. 1. On September 22, 2011, the Court granted Plaintiff's Application for Leave to Take Limited Expedited Discovery. Dkt. No. 13. The Court permitted Plaintiff to serve subpoenas on Does 1-1,474's Internet Service Providers ("ISPs") by serving a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 subpoena that seeks information sufficient to identify the Doe Defendants, including the name, address, telephone number, and email address of Does 1-2,590. *Id.* at 11. Once the ISPs provided Does 1-1,474 with a copy of the subpoena, the Court permitted Does 1-1,474 30 days from the date of service to file any motions contesting the subpoena (including a motion to quash or

1 modify the subpoena). *Id.*

2 Now before the Court is a Motion to Dismiss, filed by Doe Defendant #37 (I.P. Address  
3 108.34.138.72). Dkt. No. 22. In his motion, Doe #37 requests that the subpoena be quashed as to  
4 him and the case against him dismissed because he does not reside, work, or conduct business in  
5 California; has not contracted to supply services in California; the IP address that is identified as  
6 assigned to him is not within the jurisdiction of this Court; he has no real property in California; he  
7 does not consent to personal jurisdiction in California; he has no business or personal contacts in  
8 California; and he has no significant relationship with California. *Id.* at 3.

9 Based on this information, it appears that the Court lacks jurisdiction over Doe Defendant  
10 #37. Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS Plaintiff to either: (1) file a voluntary dismissal of  
11 Doe Defendant #37, without prejudice to filing a complaint against him in the proper jurisdiction; or  
12 (2) show cause why the Court should not grant Doe Defendant #37's motion to dismiss. Plaintiff  
13 shall file its response by November 14, 2011.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15  
16 Dated: November 1, 2011

17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Maria-Elena James  
20 Chief United States Magistrate Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28