

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 Northern District of California  
5

6 PATRICK COLLINS, INC.,

No. C 11-2766 MEJ

7 Plaintiff,

**ORDER STRIKING MOTION TO  
QUASH/DISMISS  
(IP ADDRESS 69.114.65.247)**

8 v.

9 DOES 1-2,590,

**Docket No. 33**

10 Defendants.  
11 \_\_\_\_\_/

12 On November 15, 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 “John Doe” at  
14 I.P. Address 69.114.65.247. Dkt. No. 33. Because John Doe has disclosed no identifying  
15 information, there is no way to determine whether the motion was filed by a real party in interest or  
16 a stranger to the litigation. As such, the filing is improper. The Clerk of Court shall STRIKE Dkt.  
17 Nos. 33.

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

25 Further, John Doe (and any other Doe Defendants in this action) should be aware that the  
26 Court considered the issue of joinder at length in its previous order and found that Plaintiff presented  
27 a reasonable basis to argue that the Doe Defendants’ actions in this case may fall within the  
28 definition of “same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences” for purposes of

1 joinder under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20(a). Dkt. No. 12 at 6-11. As John Doe's motion  
2 presents the same generalized arguments addressed in its previous order, even if the Court were to  
3 consider John Doe's motion, it would be without merit.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6 Dated: November 16, 2011

7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 Maria-Elena James  
10 Chief United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28