

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Magistrate Judge Kathleen M. Tafoya

Civil Action No. 12-cv-00656-CMA-KMT

SUNLUST PICTURES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DOE,
JOE,
JOHN DOE 35, and
JOHN DOE 72.207.101.141,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

ORDER ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KATHLEEN M. TAFOYA

This matter is before the court on the following motions:

–John Doe’s (IP address 75.132.12.176)¹ “Motion to Quash or Modify Subpoena.” (Doc. No. 16, filed May 14, 2012.)

–John Doe’s (No IP Address provided) “Motion to Quash or Modify Subpoena.” (Doc. No. 21, filed May 17, 2012.)

–John Doe’s (IP Address 98.165.183.92) “Motion to Quash or Modify Subpoena.” (Doc. No. 25, filed May 18, 2012.)

–John Doe’s (IP Address 72.199.132.198) “Motion to Quash or Modify Subpoena.” (Doc. No. 26, filed May 18, 2012.)

¹ The court notes that several of the parties filing the listed motions have used identical pseudonyms, such as “John Doe” or “Robert Roe,” and/or identical titles for their motions. To avoid confusion, when possible, the court has included the IP Addresses for the filer of each motion.

–John Doe’s (IP Address 75.142.192.28) “Notice of Motion and Motion to Quash Subpoena Served Upon Custodian of Records, Charter Communications.” (Doc. No. 27, filed May 18, 2012.)

–John Doe’s (IP Address 68.9.54.33) “Motion to Quash or Modify Subpoena.” (Doc. No. 28, filed May 21, 2012.)

–“Robert Roe’s (IP Address 24.251.234.130) Motion to Dismiss and/or Issue a Protective Order, and Incorporated Memorandum of Law.” (Doc. No. 31, filed May 21, 2012.)

–“Robert Roe’s (IP Address 24.183.52.130) Motion to Dismiss and/or Issue a Protective Order, and Incorporated Memorandum of Law.” (Doc. No. 33, filed May 21, 2012.)

–“Robert Roe’s (IP Address 71.94.143.188) Motion to Dismiss and/or Issue a Protective Order and Incorporated Memorandum of Law.” (Doc. No. 34, filed May 21, 2012.)

–“Joe’s” Motion to Quash Subpoena and/or Dismiss. (Doc. No. 35, filed May 21, 2012.)

–“Motion of John Doe No. 35 to Proceed Anonymously and Motion to Quash Subpoena [sic].” (Doc. No. 40, filed May 21, 2012.)

–“Robert Roe’s (IP Address 71.94.143.188) Motion to Dismiss and/or Issue a Protective Order, and Incorporated Memorandum of Law.” (Doc. No. 41, filed May 21, 2012.)

–John Doe’s “Notice and Motion for Dismissal and to Quash Plaintiff’s Subpoena and/or to Modify Order Allowing Expedited Discovery.” (Doc. No. 43, filed May 22, 2012.)

–“Robert Roe’s (IP Address 24.176.192.207) Motion to Dismiss and/or Issue a Protective Order, and Incorporated Memorandum of Law.” (Doc. No. 46, filed May 23, 2012.)

–“John Doe’s Motion to Dismiss and/or Issue a Protective Order, and Incorporated Memorandum of Law.” (Doc. No. 50, filed May 23, 2012.)

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(a) provides that “[e]very pleading, written motion, and other paper must be signed by at least one attorney of record in the attorney’s name—or by a party personally if the party is unrepresented.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a). Additionally, such papers “must state the signer’s address, e-mail address, and telephone number.” *Id.* Consistent with Federal Rule 11(a), the local rules of this court provide that “[t]he name, current mailing address, and telephone number of any attorney of record or *pro se* party filing a paper shall be typed in a signature block at the end of the paper.” D.C.COLO.LCivR. 10.1K.

Each of the motions listed above fail to include the information required by Federal Rule 11(a) and Local Rule 10.1K. Although the court does not rule at this juncture on whether these parties may proceed by pseudonym, the remaining information is essential for the court and opposing

party to serve court filings on these individuals.² Accordingly, no later than **July 5, 2012**, each of the parties responsible for filing the motions listed above shall file a **Status Report** providing the court with the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a) and D.C.COLO.LCivR 10.1K. If any or all of these parties fail to file a Status Report consistent with this order, their respective motion(s) will be stricken without further notice and will not be heard at the Motion Hearing set for July 12, 2012.

Dated: June 19, 2012

² Indeed, to this effect, the court notes that there is no assurance that the filers of the motions listed above will receive this order. However, the court assumes that these individuals may be monitoring this litigation and, if so, will receive notice via the Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) system.