

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

**\*E-FILED 02-18-2011\***

NOT FOR CITATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION  
WILLOW TV INTERNATIONAL, INC., No. C11-00568 HRL

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER (1) GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO CONDUCT  
EXPEDITED DISCOVERY; AND (2)  
DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR AN ORDER  
SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING**

**[Re: Docket Nos. 3 and 4]**

DOE 1 d/b/a CRICKLINX.COM,  
DOE 2 d/b/a CAUGHT-OFFSIDE.COM,  
DOE 3 d/b/a CRICFREE.NET,  
DOE 4 d/b/a CRICKETONPC.NET,  
DOE 5 d/b/a CYBERCRICKET.NET,  
DOE 6 d/b/a CYBERVIEWTV.ORG,  
DOE 7 d/b/a LIVEFEEDONLINE.COM,  
DOE 8 d/b/a MYKHEL.COM,  
DOE 9 d/b/a TVNSPORTS.COM,  
DOE 10 d/b/a DESICRICKETS.COM,  
DOE 11 d/b/a DESIBLAST.TV,  
DOE 12 d/b/a WATCHLIVECRICKET.COM,  
DOE 13 d/b/a WATCH-LIVE-CRICKET.COM,  
DOE 14 d/b/a SPECTRALMEDIA.ORG,  
DOE 15 d/b/a CRICZONE.NET,  
DOE 16 d/b/a CRICKETSTREAMING.TV,  
DOE 17 d/b/a ESPNCRICKET.NET,  
DOE 18 d/b/a LIVECRICKET-  
CHANNEL.COM,  
DOE 19 d/b/a CRICKETWORLD CUP.TV,  
DOE 20 d/b/a CRICKETBENCH.COM,  
DOE 21 d/b/a CRICKETFIRMS.COM,  
KHAN BABA, USMAN NAWAZ, RAHUL  
KHANA, CAVIR SONS CO., PRQ INET KB,  
GOTTFRID SWARTHOLM, SAMEUL  
RODRIGO, RAM KUMMA, ALLAN SMITH,  
FARHA JANAN, MEDIA ENTERTAINMENT  
GUIDE, HARMAN BAWEJA, KARANBIR  
SINGH DHULLA, WHOIS GUARD,  
PRIVACYPROTECT.ORG, DOMAINS BY  
PROXY, INC., DOMAIN PRIVACY GROUP,  
INC. and DOES 22 to 100, inclusive,  
Defendants.

1 Plaintiff Willow TV International, Inc. says that, through a license agreement with  
2 ESPN, it has the exclusive right to broadcast cricket matches and events in the United States.  
3 Plaintiff says that it is also authorized to take action for copyright violations. According to the  
4 complaint, defendants are pirating cricket broadcasts and re-broadcasting them, without  
5 permission, on their websites. Plaintiff now moves for leave to conduct expedited discovery it  
6 says is necessary to identify the Doe defendants. The matter is deemed appropriate for  
7 determination without oral argument, and plaintiff's motion for an order setting an expedited  
8 hearing is denied as moot. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). Having considered the moving papers, this court  
9 finds that plaintiff has made a sufficient showing warranting discovery to identify the  
10 defendants. See FED. R. CIV. P. 26(d)(1); *Semitoil, Inc. v. Tokyo Electron America, Inc.*, 208  
11 F.R.D. 273, 275-76 (N.D. Cal. 2002). See also *Columbia Ins. Co. v. Seescandy.com*, 185  
12 F.R.D. 573, 578-80 (N.D. Cal. 1999). Accordingly, plaintiff's motion is granted as follows:

13 Plaintiff may conduct discovery now to determine defendants' identities. Any such  
14 discovery that is served shall be targeted to obtain information sufficient to identify the Doe  
15 defendants, including name(s), address(es), telephone number(s), email address(es), and billing  
16 information. Any information disclosed to plaintiff shall be used by plaintiff solely for the  
17 purpose of protecting its rights asserted in this lawsuit.

18 In granting plaintiff leave to conduct discovery to identify defendants, this court does  
19 not intend to foreclose any valid objections that may be raised by persons and entities  
20 responding to plaintiff's discovery requests.

21 SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: February 18, 2011

23   
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 HOWARD R. LLOYD  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
27  
28

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

5:11-cv-00568-HRL Notice has been electronically mailed to:  
Holly Pranger hpranger@prangerlaw.com, tstordahl@prangerlaw.com  
Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.