## 

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

| TNT | THE         | LIMITED | CTATEC | <b>DISTRICT</b> | COLIDT |
|-----|-------------|---------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| IIN | $1$ $\Pi$ C | UNITED  | SIAIES | DISTRICT        | COURT  |

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HARMEET DHILLON,

No. C 13-1465 SI

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING ADMINISTRATIVE MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO TAKE EARLY DISCOVERY

DOE 1, an unknown individual, and DOES 2-10,

Defendants.

Plaintiff's administrative motions for leave to take early discovery are scheduled for a hearing on November 7, 2013. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), the Court determines that the matters are appropriate for resolution without oral argument, and VACATES the hearing. For the reasons set forth below, plaintiff's motions are DENIED.

Plaintiff seeks leave to issue two subpoenas, one directed at an attorney and one directed at Google, Inc., in order to learn the identity of "Doe 1" to facilitate service of process on Doe 1. The complaint alleges that Doe 1 anonymously published an article titled "Meet Harmeet" on the website www.mungergames.net, and that the article featured a copyrighted photograph of plaintiff. Doe 1, appearing through counsel, opposes the administrative motions on numerous grounds, including that they are unnecessary because Doe 1's counsel has informed plaintiff's counsel that she will accept service of process on behalf of Doe 1. Doe 1 also states that he/she has "immediate plans" to file a motion to dismiss and/or a motion for summary judgment on plaintiff's copyright infringement claim.

## United States District Court For the Northern District of California

## Case3:13-cv-01465-SI Document42 Filed11/04/13 Page2 of 2 Based upon these representations by Doe 1, the Court DENIES plaintiff's administrative motions as unnecessary. Counsel for Doe 1 is ORDERED to accept service of process on Doe 1; and Doe 1 is directed to promptly file a motion to dismiss and/or motion for summary judgment. This order resolves Docket Nos. 20 and 24. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 4, 2013 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE