

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 STRIKING
MOTION TO DISMISS**

8 v.

9 DOES 1-1745,


10 Defendants.
_____ /

11
12 On June 22, 2011, an anonymous defendant noticed a motion to dismiss the complaint,
13 which names only Doe defendants. The litigant identifies himself or herself only as “Defendant
14 Doe #733.” Because “Defendant Doe #733” has disclosed no identifying information, there is no
15 way to determine whether the motion was filed by a real party in interest or a stranger to the
16 litigation. As such, the filing is improper. The clerk shall **STRIKE** Dkt. Nos. 25 and 13.

17 If “Defendant Doe #333” wishes to appear in this action anonymously or otherwise, he or
18 she must follow the proper procedures for doing so. At a minimum, the Court and the parties
19 must be informed of the litigant’s identity. If the litigant wishes to protect his or her identity from
20 the *public*, the litigant may use a pseudonym in public filings only after receiving permission for
21 good cause shown. Counsel are advised that the Ninth Circuit court of appeals allows the use of
22 pseudonyms only in the most unusual cases. *See, e.g., Does I thru XXIII v. Advanced Textile*
23 *Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1058, 1067–68 (9th Cir. 2000).

24
25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26
27 Dated: June 23, 2011.

28


WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE