

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

CP PRODUCTIONS, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 10 C 6255
)	
DOES 1-300,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM ORDER

As the caption of this action suggests, it is an understatement to characterize it as problematic in nature. It was filed more than four months ago (on September 29, 2010), so that the time prescribed for service on each of the 300 anonymous putative defendants under Fed. R. Civ. P. ("Rule") 4(m) has expired. Moreover, the few developments that have taken place since the action's filing--most recently a motion to quash filed by one of the "Doe" defendants--tend to confirm that this lawsuit is not an appropriate vehicle for the accomplishment of the goal stated in Complaint ¶1:

This action has been filed by Plaintiff to combat the willful and intentional infringement of its copyrighted creative works and includes a civil claim for copyright infringement. Defendants, whose names Plaintiff expects to ascertain during discovery, illegally reproduced and distributed Plaintiff's copyrighted creative works via computer networks and upon information and belief continue to do the same.

Instead the course of action chosen by counsel for CP Productions, Inc. plainly has the potential to perpetrate the type of abuse identified in the most recent motion to quash and,

indeed, the motion to quash filed earlier by a Tennessee lawyer who lists herself as "Attorney for Doe 300."

Accordingly this Court complies with the mandate of Rule 4(m) by dismissing this action without prejudice against all defendants. Counsel for CP Productions, Inc. is notified that no motion for reconsideration of this order will be entertained in the absence of an appropriate showing of justification for such reconsideration.¹



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: February 7, 2011

¹ This order of dismissal moots the current motion to quash (Dkt. 25), which is therefore denied on that basis.