

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

4
5 NEW SENSATIONS, INC., a California
corporation,

No. C 10-05863 WHA

6 Plaintiff,

7 v.

8 DOES 1-1745,

**ORDER STRIKING
MOTION TO QUASH
SUBPOENAS, DISMISS
ACTION, AND VACATE
PREVIOUS ORDERS**

9 Defendant.
10 _____/

11 On August 16, 2011, an anonymous litigant filed a motion requesting the Court to quash
12 all outstanding subpoenas, dismiss the action, and vacate a previous order allowing discovery.
13 The anonymous litigant is represented by counsel, who identifies his client only as “Moving
14 Defendant 173.76.128.164” (Dkt. No. 55). Because “Moving Defendant 173.76.128.164” has
15 disclosed no identifying information, there is no way to determine whether the motion was filed
16 by a real party in interest or a stranger to the litigation. As such, the filing is improper.
17 Additionally, to the extent the motion contests personal jurisdiction, it is premature, because the
18 movant has not yet been named as a defendant in the action. The clerk shall **STRIKE** Dkt. No. 55.

19 If “Moving Defendant 173.76.128.164” wishes to appear in this action anonymously or
20 otherwise, he or she must follow the proper procedures for doing so. At a minimum, the Court
21 and the parties must be informed of the litigant’s identity. If the litigant wishes to protect his or
22 her identity from the *public*, the litigant may use a pseudonym in public filings only after
23 receiving permission for good cause shown. The court of appeals, however, allows the use of
24 pseudonyms only in the most unusual cases. *See, e.g., Does I thru XXIII v. Advanced Textile*
25 *Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1058, 1067–68 (9th Cir. 2000).

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

27
28 Dated: August 17, 2011.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE