

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JANE DOE,
Plaintiff,
v.
GEORGE STREET PHOTO & VIDEO,
LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. [16-cv-02698-MEJ](#)

**ORDER VACATING CMC; SETTING
BRIEFING SCHEDULE; REQUIRING
PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
SHE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO KEEP
PROCEEDING PSEUDONYMOUSLY**

This matter is currently scheduled for a Case Management Conference on September 29, 2016. The parties have filed a Joint Case Management Statement in which they inform the Court that Defendant intends to file a motion to compel arbitration and stay the case pending the outcome of that motion. *See* Jt. Stmt. at 5, Dkt. No. 23. Given Defendant’s potentially case-dispositive motion, the Court finds setting pretrial deadlines would be premature and accordingly **VACATES** the Case Management Conference and all related deadlines. Because Defendant has yet to file a responsive pleading in this action, the Court **ORDERS** Defendant to file its motion to compel arbitration no later than October 13, 2016, Plaintiff to file her opposition no later than October 27, 2016, and Defendant to file its reply no later than November 3, 2016. The Court will hear the motion on December 8, 2016. The Case Management Conference will be rescheduled, if necessary, after the motion is resolved.

Defendant also represents that Plaintiff sat for an interview with NBC News regarding the details of this case. Jt. Stmt. at 4. Plaintiff does not contradict this representation. Plaintiff previously requested and was granted permission to proceed under a pseudonym and for a protective order to secure her privacy. Req., Dkt. No. 10; Pseudonym Order, Dkt. No. 15. In its Order, the Court noted that “Plaintiff alleges Defendants’ actions resulted in the mass exposure of

1 the sensitive and highly personal excerpts of her wedding video, leading to the public openly
2 scrutinizing and criticizing her online. She alleges this ‘public shaming’ has caused her great
3 embarrassment, humiliation, and emotional distress [], and while thus far her name is not
4 associated with this video, it is reasonable that she risks further stigmatization and embarrassment
5 if her name is linked to the video.” Pseudonym Order at 4. The Court, however, specifically
6 noted it has “discretion to reevaluate the need to proceed pseudonymously as litigation
7 progresses.” *Id.* at 4-5. In light of the foregoing, the Court now **ORDERS** Plaintiff to show cause
8 why she should be allowed to keep proceeding pseudonymously in this action. Plaintiff shall
9 respond to the order to show cause no later than **October 6, 2016**.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11
12 Dated: September 26, 2016

13 
14 _____
15 MARIA-ELENA JAMES
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28