

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 CAMELOT DISTRIBUTION GROUP,  
11 INC.,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 DOES,

15 Defendants.  
16

Case No. CV 11-1949 DDP (FMOx)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
EXPEDITED DISCOVERY**

17 Having reviewed plaintiff's Motion for Expedited Discovery ("Motion"), the court finds that  
18 the Motion is deficient because it does not clearly set forth each Internet Service Provider ("ISP")  
19 for which plaintiff requests authorization to serve subpoenas. Although plaintiff included a chart  
20 of the defendant Does' Internet Protocol ("IP") addresses and a column for the ISPs that  
21 correspond to the IP addresses, many of the ISP names are cut-off. (See Motion, Declaration of  
22 Scott M. Plamondon, Exh. B). Plaintiff must clearly identify each ISP so that each may be given  
23 proper notice. In addition, plaintiff must establish why discovery is needed from each ISP.  
24 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT plaintiff's Motion for Expedited Discovery (**Document No. 5**)  
25 is **denied** without prejudice.

26 Dated this 16th day of March, 2011.

27 \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
28 Fernando M. Olguin  
United States Magistrate Judge