

Honorable Judge Robert S. Lasnik

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE**

Riding Films, Inc,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Does 1- 64,
Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-00288 RAJ-RSL

Request for Judicial Notice

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201 and the authorities cited below, Doe 06 hereby requests that this Court take judicial notice of the following materials:

A. Magistrate Ruling, U.S. District Court, Eastern District for New York, In Re Bit Torrent Adult Film Copyright Infringement Cases, Order and Recommendation, Case 2:11-cv-03995-DRH-GRB, Docket # 39

B. District Judge Ruling, Safety Point Products, LLC et al., *Plaintiffs* v. DOES 1-14, DOES 15-96, DOES 97-177, & DOES 178-197, Defendants, Case Nos 1:12-CV-2812, 1:12-CV-2820;1:12-CV-2831; 1:12-CV-2894, OPINION & ORDER date April 4, 2013

C. Magistrate Ruling, On the Cheap, LLC v. Does 1-5011, U. S. District Court, Northern District of California, Case No. C-10-4472 BZ, Docket # 66.

1 D. Magistrate Ruling, AF Holdings v. Does 1-96, U. S. District Court, Northern District of
2 California, Case No. C-11-03335 JSC, Docket # 14, Order Denying Without Prejudice Plaintiff's
3 Request for Discovery Prior to Rule 26(f) Conference.

4 E. *Voltage Pictures v. various John Does*, 6:13-cv-290AA, 2:13-cv-292AA, and 1:13-cv-
5 295AA (D.C. Oregon, April 10, 2013)

6 A district court may take judicial notice of facts that are “not subject to reasonable dispute in
7 that [they are] either (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court or (2)
8 capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot
9 reasonably be questioned.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(b); see also *Limestone Dev. Corp. v. Vill. of*
10 *Lemont*, 473 F. Supp. 2d 858, 868 (N.D. Ill. 2007) (taking judicial notice of state court litigation
11 because “[j]udicial notice is premised on the concept that certain facts or propositions exist
12 which a court may accept as true without requiring additional proof from the opposing parties”).
13 Furthermore, the Federal Rules of Evidence require a court to take judicial notice of a matter “if
14 requested by a party and supplied with the necessary information.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(d); see also
15 *In re Ravisent Techs., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 00-CV-1014, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13255, at * 2
16 (E.D. Pa. July 12, 2004).

17 Exhibits A-F are all orders from United States Federal District Courts. It is well established
18 that a court may take judicial notice of matters of public record. *Opoka v. I.N.S.*, 94 F.3d 392,
19 394 (7th Cir. 1996) (“Indeed, it is a well-settled principle that the decision of another court or
20 agency, including the decision of an administrative law judge, is a proper subject of judicial
21 notice.”); *Berg v. United Steelworkers of Am., Local 3733*, No. 98-308, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
22 4518, at *19-20 (E.D. Pa. April 8, 1998) (citing 5A Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller,
23 Federal Practice and Procedure, Civil 2d § 1357 (1990) (“matters of public record ... may also be

1 taken into account’)). Specifically, federal courts may take judicial notice of proceedings in other
2 courts, both within and outside of the federal judicial system, if those proceedings have a direct
3 relation to matters at issue. *Allen v. City of Los Angeles*, 92 F.3d 842 (9th Cir. 1992).

4 These documents are offered to show how courts around the nation have handled issues of
5 joinder and other issues in analogous cases. Thus, they are appropriate subject matter for judicial
6 notice pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201(b)(2).

7 For the foregoing reasons, Does 45 requests that this Court consider Exhibits A-F as it
8 reviews its Motion to Quash.

9 Respectfully submitted this 6th day of May, 2013

10 Law Offices of Gary Marshall

11 By /s/ Gary K. Marshall
12 Gary K. Marshall, WSBA # 15344
13 Attorneys for
14 Doe 45 with IP address 174.61.182.92
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23