IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 13-cv-02143-WYD-MEH

INSTINCTIVE FILM GmbH, a German Limited Liability Company,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOES 1-15,

Defendants.

ORDER

Michael E. Hegarty, United States Magistrate Judge.

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Take Discovery Prior to Rule 26(f) Conference [filed August 12, 2013; docket #7]. Plaintiff's motion is **granted** as follows.

Plaintiff's motion alleges that the Doe Defendants, identified only by their Internet Protocol ("IP") addresses, have infringed on Plaintiff's copyrighted work by using the internet and a "BitTorrent" protocol to reproduce, distribute, display, or perform Plaintiff's protected film. Plaintiff requests permission from the Court to serve limited, immediate discovery on the Doe Defendants' Internet Service Providers ("ISPs") prior to the Rule 26(f) conference. The purpose of this discovery is to obtain additional information concerning the identities of the Doe Defendants.

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 in part as follows. The Plaintiff may

serve third party subpoenas pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 45 on the identified ISPs with the limited

purpose of ascertaining the identities of the Doe Defendants as identified by the fifteen

corresponding IP addresses listed in Exhibit A to Plaintiff's Complaint (docket #1-1). The

subpoenas shall be limited to providing Plaintiff with the name, address, email address, and Media

Access Control address of the subscriber (Doe Defendant) to whom the ISP has assigned an IP

address. With each subpoena, Plaintiff shall also serve a copy of this Order. Each ISP shall notify

the subscribers that their identities have been subpoenaed by the Plaintiff. Finally, the Court

emphasizes that Plaintiff may only use the information disclosed in response to the subpoenas 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.

Entered and dated at Denver, Colorado, this 19th day of August, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

Michael E. Hegarty

United States Magistrate Judge

Michael E. Hegarty

2