

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 12-cv-01642-CMA-MEH

PATRICK COLLINS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOES 1-32,

Defendants.

---

**MINUTE ORDER**

---

**Entered by Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge, on August 14, 2012.**

Defendant Doe #13's Special Appearance Motion to Dismiss Party, Motion to Quash Subpoena, Motion for Protective Order, Motion to Sever for Improper Joinder [filed August 10, 2012; docket #16] and Defendant Doe #13's Amended<sup>1</sup> Special Appearance Motion to Dismiss Party, Motion to Quash Subpoena, Motion for Protective Order, Motion to Sever for Improper Joinder [filed August 13, 2012; docket #18] are **denied without prejudice** for failure to seek permission from the Court to proceed anonymously. *See K-Beech, Inc. v. Does 1-29*, 826 F. Supp. 2d 903, 905 (W.D.N.C. 2011) (noting that a party who wishes to proceed anonymously may overcome the presumption against anonymous proceedings by filing a well-reasoned motion to proceed anonymously); *see also West Coast Prods., Inc. v. Does 1-5829*, 275 F.R.D. 9, 12 (D.D.C. 2011) (“federal courts generally allow parties to proceed anonymously only under certain special circumstances when anonymity is necessary to protect a person from harassment, injury, ridicule or personal embarrassment”). If the Defendant John Doe cited herein wishes to re-file his motion in accordance with this order and all applicable local and federal court rules, he may do so **on or before September 4, 2012** and must first (or contemporaneously) file a motion to proceed anonymously. The Court warns the parties that it may strike any motion or other filing that deviates from the requirements of this order or from those set forth in the applicable local or federal rules.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court notes that the “amended” motion appears to be identical to the original motion and Doe 13 fails to identify what purportedly has been amended in the new motion.