

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
 3 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 4

5 NEW SENSATIONS, INC., a California
 6 corporation,

No. C 10-05863 WHA

7 Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING
 MOTION FOR A
 PROTECTIVE ORDER**

8 v.

9 DOES 1-1745,


10 Defendants.
 _____/

11
 12 On June 21, 2011, *pro se* defendant Ronald Burr Jr. filed a motion for a protective order,
 13 as well as a motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, a motion to quash or vacate a
 14 subpoena, and an affidavit supporting the latter two motions. The motion for a protective order
 15 requests permission for defendant Burr to proceed as an anonymous litigant in order to protect his
 16 identity. Specifically, defendant Burr wishes to proceed “substantially in the form of ‘John
 17 Doe #XXXX (identity protected)’”

18 Such pseudonyms may be used only in unusual cases when nondisclosure of a party’s
 19 identity is necessary to protect a person from harassment, injury, ridicule, or personal
 20 embarrassment.” *Does I thru XXIII v. Advanced Textile Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1058, 1067–68
 21 (9th Cir. 2000). Here, defendant seeks “to protect his identity from being disclosed to the
 22 Plaintiff and automatically subjecting himself to the jurisdiction of this court.” Defendant’s
 23 strategic and jurisdictional concerns do not entitle him to litigate anonymously. Good cause not
 24 having been shown, defendant Burr’s motion for a protective order is **DENIED**. The clerk shall
 25 place all four of the June 21 filings in the public docket without redacting any information.

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27
 28 Dated: June 22, 2011.



 WILLIAM ALSUP
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE