

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

BODYGUARD PRODUCTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff,  
v.

DOE 1, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C17-1647RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

This matter was filed on November 3, 2017. *See* Dkt. #1. Plaintiff Bodyguard Productions, Inc., (“Bodyguard”) alleges seventeen Doe Defendants participated in the same BitTorrent “swarm” to infringe the same unique copy of the movie *The Hitman’s Bodyguard*. *Id.* ¶¶ 10–14. Because the identities of the Doe Defendants are unknown, Bodyguard filed a motion to expedite discovery. Dkt. #5. The Doe Defendants are represented by Internet Protocol (“IP”) addresses which allegedly demonstrate they participated in on-line sharing of *The Hitman’s Bodyguard* between 5:54 p.m. on September 17, 2017, and 10:42 a.m. on September 30, 2017. Dkt. #1, Ex. B. Although the evidence of internet activity shows that hours, days, and in some cases weeks, separated each defendant’s allegedly infringing conduct, Bodyguard alleges that all seventeen Doe

1 Defendants participated in a single BitTorrent “swarm,” and that the “swarm” aspect of their  
2 alleged file-sharing justifies joinder of these defendants in a single lawsuit. *See id.* ¶¶ 18–24.

3 Although this is the first case filed by Bodyguard, its counsel has filed dozens of BitTorrent  
4 cases against hundreds of doe defendants in this District. As the Court becomes more familiar  
5 with these BitTorrent cases, concern about the potential for abuse in these matters has arisen. *See,*  
6 *e.g., Venice PI, LLC v. Doe 1, et al.,* Case No. C17-988TSZ, Dkt. #27 ¶¶ 2 n.1 and 3. Bodyguard’s  
7 counsel’s actions in this district are of particular concern, and the Court questions the propriety of  
8 Bodyguard’s efforts to join several doe defendants in a single matter. *See id.; also Cobbler*  
9 *Nevada, LLC v. Kevin James,* Case No. C15-1430-TSZ, Dkt. #78. Given these concerns, and  
10 having reviewed the record in this and related cases, the Court hereby ORDERS as follows:  
11  
12

- 13 1. Plaintiff shall, within fourteen days of this Order, show cause in writing why the  
14 Court should not: (1) sever all defendants except the first defendant in this case;  
15 and (2) dismiss the remaining defendants without prejudice.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17  
18 Dated this 27 day of November, 2017.

19  
20 

21 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
22 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28