



1 quashing any outstanding subpoenas. For the same reasons, the undersigned **RECOMMENDS** in this case  
2 that all Defendants except Defendant Darian Spriggs be **SEVERED** and **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

3 To the extent any subpoenas remain outstanding in this case, they are hereby **QUASHED**. Plaintiff  
4 is **ORDERED** to promptly serve a copy of this order on the recipients of any outstanding subpoenas, and  
5 shall file a proof of service of the same by June 20, 2017. The recipient(s) of any outstanding subpoenas  
6 shall retain the subpoenaed information for a period of at least 60 days from the date of the issuance of this  
7 order, so that it will be available if Plaintiff proceeds in a prompt manner against the remaining defendants  
8 in new cases and obtains permission to seek early discovery in those cases.

9 Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to promptly serve a copy of this order and report and recommendation, as  
10 well as the order and report and recommendation issued concurrently herewith in *ME2 Productions, Inc.*  
11 *v. Bayu*, Case No. 2:17-cv-00724-JCM-NJK, on any defendant who has not yet appeared, and shall file a  
12 proof of service of the same by June 20, 2017.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED

14 Dated: June 13, 2017

15  
16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 NANCY J. KOPPE  
19 United States Magistrate Judge

20 NOTICE

21 Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2, any objection to this Report and Recommendation must be in writing  
22 and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days. The Supreme Court has held that the courts  
23 of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the  
24 specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file  
25 objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues  
26 waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the  
27 District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*,  
28 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).