

E-Filed

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 12-6635-GHK (RZx)	Date	December 10, 2012
Title	<i>Ingenuity 13 LLC v. John Doe</i>		

**Presiding: The Honorable** **GEORGE H. KING, CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE**

Beatrice Herrera	N/A	N/A
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:  
(none)

Attorneys Present for Defendants:  
(none)

**Proceedings: Order re: Order Dismissing Action**

On August 1, 2012, Plaintiff Ingenuity 13 LLC (“Plaintiff”) filed the above-captioned action in this Court against Defendant John Doe (“Doe Defendant”), alleging violations of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101, *et seq.* Plaintiff alleges that it does not know Doe Defendant’s actual name and knows Doe Defendant only by the (“IP”) address 99.12.183.52. Plaintiff states that it cannot ascertain Defendant’s actual identity without limited early discovery. On August 7, 2012, we issued an order warning Plaintiff that it must abide by Rule 4(m)’s requirement to identify and serve the Doe Defendant within 120 days of filing the Complaint. We specifically stated in the order that Plaintiff’s “[f]ailure to timely and adequately comply as required herein by serving the defendant or showing good cause why the defendant cannot be ascertained by DECEMBER 5, 2012, will result in dismissal of this action.” (Dkt. No. 7, at 2). On August 30, 2012, Judge Zarefsky granted Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application for Leave to Take Expedited Discovery to identify the Doe Defendant associated with the relevant IP address.

Plaintiff has failed to timely effect service pursuant to Rule 4(m) and our August 7, 2012 Order. Nor has Plaintiff showed cause why it could not timely effect service. Accordingly, this action is hereby **DISMISSED** for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with our order.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_ : \_\_\_\_\_  
 Initials of Deputy Clerk                      Bea