

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Northern District of California

, INC.,	No. C 11-2770 MEJ
Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO QUASH
	Docket Nos. 37, 38
Defendants.	
	Plaintiff,

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 1-1,474. *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

2

1

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

1213

1415

16

1718

19

2021

2223

24

2526

27

28

Now before the Court is a Motion to Quash, filed by an individual Doe Defendant requesting that he be allowed to contest the subpoena without revealing his personal identifying information.¹

Dkt. Nos. 37, 38. In his motion, the Doe Defendant argues that he has never downloaded a movie or show from BitTorrent, nor does he know how to do so. However, a general denial of engaging in copyright infringement is not a valid basis for a motion to quash. *MCGIP*, *LLC v. Does 1-18*, 2011 WL 2181620, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 02, 2011) (citation omitted). As the Doe Defendant presents no other arguments, his motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 15, 2011

modify the subpoena). Id.

Maria-Elena James Chief United States Magistrate Judge

¹Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), a magistrate judge has jurisdiction to hear and decide nondispositive matters without the consent of the parties. A motion to quash is normally considered a non-dispositive matter, Arista Records, LLC v. Doe 3, 604 F.3d 110, 116 (2d Cir. 2010), and therefore, the undersigned has jurisdiction to rule on the Defendant's motion(s) to the extent they seek to quash Plaintiff's subpoena. In addition, a magistrate judge has jurisdiction to consider the question of whether joinder of unserved defendants is proper, including whether unserved defendants should be severed and dismissed from the action, because defendants who have not been served are not considered "parties" under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). Neals v. Norwood, 59 F.3d 530, 532 (5th Cir. 1995) (holding that magistrate judge had jurisdiction to dismiss prison inmate's action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as frivolous without consent of defendants because defendants had not been served yet and therefore were not parties); see also United States v. Real Property, 135 F.3d 1212, 1217 (9th Cir. 1998) (holding that magistrate judge had jurisdiction to enter default judgment in an in rem forfeiture action even though property owner had not consented to it because 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1) only requires the consent of the parties and the property owner, having failed to comply with the applicable filing requirements, was not a party). Here, Plaintiff has consented to magistrate jurisdiction and the Doe Defendants have not yet been served. Therefore, the Court finds that it has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) to decide the issues raised in the instant motion(s).