

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)<sup>1</sup> “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.)

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.)

On June 19, 2012, the court entered a Minute Order (Doc. No. 69) noting that the filers of the above-listed Motions failed to include in their motions the information required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(a) and Local Rule 10.1K. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a) (“Every 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 . . .” and such papers must also “state the signer’s address, e-mail address, and telephone number.”); D.C.COLO.LCivR 10.1K (“The 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.”) Accordingly, the court directed the filers of the above motions to file Status Reports no later than July 5, 2012, providing the court with the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a) and D.C.COLO.LCivR 10.1K. (*Id.*) The court further noted that if the parties responsible for filing the above motions failed to file such Status Reports, the respective motions would be stricken. (*Id.*)

No Status Reports responsive to the court's Minute Order were filed on or before July 5, 2012. Although the court does not opine as to whether these individuals' attempts to proceed by pseudonym is permissible, the remaining information required by these rules is essential for the court and opposing counsel to serve court filings on these individuals. (*See* Doc. No. 69.) Accordingly, the above-listed Motions (Doc. Nos. 16, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 33, 34, 35, 40, 41, 43, 46, & 50) are STRICKEN for failure to provide the information required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a) and D.C.COLO.LCivR 10.1K.

Dated: July 10, 2012