

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
**Judge Philip A. Brimmer**

Civil Action No. 16-cv-03115-PAB-KMT

JANE DOE, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware corporation,  
UBER USA, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and  
RASIER, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**

---

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's Unopposed Motion to Proceed Under Pseudonym Jane Doe [Docket No. 26].

Plaintiff's allegations relate to an alleged sexual assault. Docket No. 26 at 2. Plaintiff claims that she would be harmed if not allowed to proceed under a pseudonym because "revealing her identity will harm her professional relationships and future aspirations" and that the public interest favors concealing the identity of sexual assault victims. *Id.* at 4.

The Court finds that this is one of the "exceptional cases involving matters of a highly sensitive and personal nature" where proceeding under a pseudonym is appropriate. *Femedeer v. Haun*, 227 F.3d 1244, 1246 (10th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Doe v. Frank*, 951 F.2d 320, 324 (11th Cir. 1992)). Further, in light of plaintiff's allegations, the Court finds that the public interest in knowing a litigant's identity does not outweigh the

plaintiff's privacy interests. See *M.M. v. Zavaras*, 139 F.3d 798, 802 (10th Cir. 1998) (discussing *Lindsey v. Dayton-Hudson Corp.*, 592 F.2d 1118 (10th Cir. 1979)).

Therefore, the Court will grant plaintiff's request to proceed under the pseudonym Jane Doe.

For the foregoing reasons, it is

**ORDERED** that plaintiff's Unopposed Motion to Proceed Under Pseudonym Jane Doe [Docket No. 26] is **GRANTED**.

DATED June 1, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

s/Philip A. Brimmer  
PHILIP A. BRIMMER  
United States District Judge