

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____)	
DONKEYBALL MOVIE, LLC)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 10-cv-1520 (EGS)
)	
DOES 1 - 171)	
)	
<i>Defendants.</i>)	
_____)	

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed this copyright infringement action alleging that the defendant John Does have illegally copied and distributed plaintiff's motion picture. Because plaintiff does not know the names of the alleged infringers, but instead has identified only the Internet Protocol ("IP") addresses of the computers associated with the alleged infringement, plaintiff subpoenaed the Internet Service Providers ("Providers") who service the identified IP addresses to discover the names, addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses and Media Access Control Numbers of the defendants. By Order dated October 19, 2010, the Court ordered the Providers to give notice of the subpoena to their customers. The Court-ordered notice contained information about the subpoena, and explained that the Doe defendants could, individually, move to quash the subpoena. To date, no Doe defendant has done so; however, in anticipation of future filings, the Court believes it is advisable to provide

further clarification about the Doe defendants' anonymity should any of them choose to file a motion to quash.

Local Civil Rule 5(e)(1) provides that "[t]he first filing by or on behalf of a party shall have in the caption the name and full residence address of the party." LcvR 5.1(e)(1). Although courts have permitted litigants to proceed anonymously where the issues are "matters of a sensitive and highly personal nature," *Southern Methodist Univ. Ass'n of Women Law Students v. Wynne & Jaffe*, 599 F.2d 707 (5th Cir. 1979), parties are generally expected to identify themselves to "protect[] the public's legitimate interest in knowing all of the facts involved, including the identities of the parties." *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 56 F.3d 1448, 1463 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (citation omitted). This matter does not fall into the narrow class of cases where a party should be permitted to proceed anonymously. As more than one Judge on this Court has recently found, "[i]nternet subscribers do not have an expectation of privacy in their [identifying information] as they have already conveyed such information to their Internet Service Providers." *Achte/Neunte Boll Kino Beteiligungs GMBH & Co. v. Does 1 - 4*, 577, No. 10-453, 2010 WL 3522256, *3 (D.D.C. Sept. 10, 2010) (citations omitted) (Collyer, J.); see also *Maverick Entertainment Group, Inc. v. Does 1 - 4*, 350, No. 10-569, Order of December 1, 2010 [Doc. No. 17] (Leon, J.). Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that no future filings shall be permitted without proper identification. In the event that any anonymous pleadings are submitted for filing, the Clerk of the Court is directed to return it to the sender with a copy of this order.

SO ORDERED.

Signed: Emmet G. Sullivan
United States District Judge
January 14, 2011