

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 13-cv-00639-WYD-MEH

MALIBU MEDIA, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOE SUBSCRIBER ASSIGNED IP ADDRESS 24.8.173.143,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER**

---

**Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge.**

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Serve Third Party Subpoena Prior to a Rule 26(f) Conference [filed March 20, 2013; docket #7] and corresponding memorandum of law [docket #7-1]. Plaintiff's motion is **granted in part and denied in part** as follows.

Plaintiff's motion alleges that the Doe Defendant, identified only by his or her Internet Protocol ("IP") address, has infringed on Plaintiff's copyrighted works by using the internet and a "BitTorrent" protocol to copy Plaintiff's protected works without Plaintiff's consent. Plaintiff requests permission from the Court to serve limited, immediate discovery on the Doe Defendant's Internet Service Provider ("ISP") prior to the Rule 26(f) conference. The purpose of this discovery is to obtain additional information concerning the identity of the Doe Defendant.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d) proscribes seeking discovery before Rule 26(f) conferral. However, this prohibition is not absolute; the Court may authorize discovery upon a showing of good cause. *Pod-Ners, LLC v. Northern Feed & Bean of Lucerne Ltd. Liability Co.*, 204 F.R.D. 675, 676 (D. Colo. 2002). "Expedited discovery should be limited, however, and narrowly tailored to seek

information necessary to support expedited or preliminary relief.” *Avaya, Inc. v. Acumen Telecom Corp.*, No. 10-cv-03075-CMA-BNB , 2011 WL 9293, at \*2 (D. Colo. Jan. 3, 2011) (citation omitted).

After review of the motion, the Court finds that Plaintiff establishes good cause for limited expedited discovery. Therefore, Plaintiff’s motion is **granted** as follows. The Plaintiff may serve a third party subpoena pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 45 on the identified ISP with the limited purpose of ascertaining the identity of the Doe Defendant as identified by the IP address listed in the Complaint [docket #1]. The subpoena shall be limited to providing Plaintiff with the name, address, telephone number, and email address of the Defendant to whom the ISP has assigned an IP address. With the subpoena, Plaintiff shall also serve a copy of this Order. The ISP shall notify the subscriber that his/her identity has been subpoenaed by the Plaintiff. Finally, the Court emphasizes that Plaintiff may only use the information disclosed in response to the subpoena for the purpose of protecting and enforcing its rights as set forth in its Complaint [docket #1]. The Court cautions Plaintiff that improper use of this information may result in sanctions. All other relief requested in the proposed order [docket #7-5] is **denied**.

Entered and dated at Denver, Colorado, this 3rd day of April, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael E. Hegarty". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Michael E. Hegarty  
United States Magistrate Judge