

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| <hr/> | |) | |
| HARD DRIVE PRODUCTIONS, INC., |) |) | |
| |) |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) |) | |
| |) |) | |
| v. |) |) | Case No. 1:11-cv-01741-JDB-JMF-SBP |
| |) |) | |
| DOES 1 – 1495, |) |) | |
| |) |) | |
| Defendants. |) |) | |
| |) |) | |
| <hr/> |) |) | |

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING MOVANTS’ MOTIONS

The Court has reviewed Movants’ various motions (ECF Nos. 36, 38, 40, 42), Plaintiff’s omnibus response (ECF No. 45), and the relevant case law. Accordingly it is hereby

ORDERED that Movants’ motions are **DENIED**. Specifically it is

ORDERED that Movants’ motions to sever the case for improper joinder are **DENIED** without prejudice. It is further

ORDERED that Movants’ motions to dismiss the complaint or quash the subpoenas for lack of personal jurisdiction are **DENIED** without prejudice. It is further

ORDERED that Movants’ motions to quash the subpoena because the subpoenas impose an undue burden on Movants are **DENIED**. It is further

ORDERED that Movants’ motions to proceed anonymously for the purpose of concealing their personal identifying information from Plaintiff are **DENIED**. It is further

ORDERED that Movants’ motions to dismiss the complaint or quash the subpoenas because they did not engage in the downloading or uploading activity alleged in the complaint are **DENIED** without prejudice. It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff is advised that, as a consequence of the foregoing rulings, no motions to quash remain pending in this action.

DATE: _____

United States District Court Judge