```
1
2
3
5
                     IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                   FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6
7
    FIRST TIME VIDEOS, LLC,
8
                                           2:11-cv-03478-GEB-EFB
                  Plaintiff,
9
                                           ORDER CONTINUING STATUS
                                           (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING)
             v.
10
                                           CONFERENCE
    JOHN DOE,
11
                  Defendant.
12
13
             Plaintiff states in its Status Report filed August 8, 2012, in
14
   relevant part as follows:
15
                  Plaintiff is unable to serve the unidentified
16
             John Doe at this time. On December 30, 2011,
             Plaintiff filed its Complaint. (Doc. No. 1.) On
17
             January 6, 2011, Plaintiff filed its Amended
             Complaint. (Doc. No. 6.) Attached as Exhibit A to
18
             the Amended Complaint were a list of Internet
             Protocol addresses associated with John Doe and his
19
             co-conspirators. (Doc. No. 6-1.) Per the Amended
             Complaint, Plaintiff's agents observed these IP
20
                         unlawfully reproducing Plaintiff's
             addresses
             copyrighted work via the BitTorrent protocol. As
21
             further stated, "Plaintiff cannot ascertain the
             identities of John Doe or his co-conspirators
22
             without information from their respective Internet
             Service Providers ('ISPs')." (Doc. No. 6 at ¶ 4.)
23
                  Due to this need for information, on January
24
             12, 2012, Plaintiff filed its Ex Parte Application
             for Leave to Take Expedited Discovery requesting
25
                                                    identifying
                   ability to discover[]
                                              the
             information of the IP address holders from the
26
             relevant ISPs. (Doc. No. 7.) On January 19, 2012,
             the Court issued its Order granting in part and
27
             denying in part Plaintiff's Application. (Doc. No.
             9, "January
                          19 Order.") While not allowing
28
             Plaintiff to serve subpoenas on ISPs to identify
```

the coconspirators—thus eliminating the possibility of naming and/or serving those individuals in this case—the Court did allow Plaintiff to obtain the identifying information of the account holder whose IP address was used by John Doe to infringe on Plaintiff's copyrighted works. (Doc. No. 9.)

On April 4, 2012, after discovering that the Court's January 19 Order erroneously identified the Internet Protocol relating to John Doe, Plaintiff filed its Motion for Administrative Relief for an Order Correcting a Clerical Error Under FRCP Rule 60(a) to allow Plaintiff to serve a subpoena on John Doe's Internet Service Provider, Comcast Cable Communications ("Comcast") to identify him (Doc. No. 16). On April 16, 2012, the Court corrected the Internet Protocol address (Doc. No. 18, "April 16 Order"). Subsequently, Plaintiff served a copy of the April 16 Order and the relevant subpoena on Comcast. . .

Most recently, Plaintiff received notice from Comcast that, in light of the delay described above, the subscriber information related to John Doe was no longer in their records. As of now, therefore, that time-sensitive information no longer exists. Currently, Plaintiff is exploring its options in this case in light of Comcast's recent response.

(Status Report 1:33-3:6.)

These representations reveal this case is not ready to be scheduled. Therefore, the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference scheduled for hearing on August 20, 2012, is continued to October 29, 2012, at 9:00 a.m. A further status report shall be filed no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the Status Conference, in which Plaintiff shall address its efforts to prosecute this action.

Further, if Plaintiff fails to take sufficient steps to identify John Doe prior to the October 29, 2012 Status Conference, Plaintiff shall show cause in its status report why this action should not be dismissed for failure of prosecution. This action may be

1	dismissed with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) if
2	Plaintiff fails to respond to this Order.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: August 14, 2012
5	$A_{11} \subset D_{11}$
6	GARLAND E. BURREIL, JR.
7	Senior United States District Judge
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	