27

28

1	
2	
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5	
6	
7	HARD DRIVE PRODUCTIONS, INC.,
8	Plaintiff, No. C 11-3648 PJH
9	v. ORDER
10	DOES 1-84,
11	Defendants.
12	/
13	The instant action was recently reassigned to the undersigned judge, following the
14	filing of defendant "alleged Doe 68.105.97.108"'s notice of "non-consent" to the underlying
15	magistrate judge's jurisdiction. The court is also in receipt of plaintiff's objection to the
16	reassignment. The court has reviewed plaintiff's objection and agrees with plaintiff that,
17	since defendant is a Doe defendant whose identity is unknown and who has yet to be
18	served with process in the underlying action, defendant's standing to decline the magistrate
19	judge's jurisdiction is unclear. Reassignment to the undersigned is therefore improper, until
20	defendant Doe's identity has been determined, and service of process has been either
21	made upon the identified Doe defendant, or waived by the same.
22	The clerk is therefore directed to reassign the matter back to the magistrate judge
23	originally assigned to this action.
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.
25	Dated: October 18, 2011
26	PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
	United States District Judge