

Go to PACER. NOTE: Please use the RECAP Plug-In (<https://free.law/recap/>) on Chrome or Firefox – This will save you (and others) money.

- Select “FIND A CASE”
- Select “Search Individual Court Websites”
- Select your jurisdiction from the middle row under “U.S. District Courts” (i.e. “Nevada – ECF”)
- Select “District of Nevada - Document Filing System”
- Select “Query”
- In the “Case Number” box enter your case. (i.e. “2:16-cv-02028”) and hit the “Find This Case” button.
- Hit the “Run Query” button
- Now you are in the PACER page for your case.

ECF	Query	Reports	Utilities	Logout
2:16-cv-02028-APG-CWH LHF Productions, Inc. v. Does Andrew P. Gordon, presiding Carl W. Hoffman, referral Date filed: 08/26/2016 Date of last filing: 09/12/2016				

Query

- [Alias](#)
- [Associated Cases](#)
- [Attorney](#)
- [Deadlines/Hearings...](#)
- [Docket Report...](#)
- [Filers](#)
- [History/Documents...](#)
- [Party](#)
- [Related Transactions...](#)
- [Status](#)
- [View a Document](#)

- Here you can see the basic case detail – Plaintiff, Judge(s), date it was filed, last filing date.
- If you come to this page and the last file date hasn’t changed from the last time you looked, then no new documents/entries were made. Note: this is just a snap-shot and it can change quickly.
- Most people will only need to access the docket and/or view a document from here. Note: you can access the specific documents via the “Docket Report.”
- So select “Docket Report.”
- It will bring up a page showing how your report will be formatted. Most people will leave it in its default setting
- Select “Run Report.” Note: this is when it will start to cost you .10 a page. If you are running RECAP, a box may come up and offer the docket or document for free. Documents generally don’t change - but the docket does change as the case moves along – so the RECAPed docket may not be up to date.

United States District Court
 District of Nevada (Las Vegas)
 CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:16-cv-02028-APG-CWH

LHF Productions, Inc. v. Does
 Assigned to: Judge Andrew P. Gordon
 Referred to: Magistrate Judge Carl W. Hoffman
 Demand: \$3,450,000
 Cause: 17:101 Copyright Infringement

Date Filed: 08/26/2016
 Jury Demand: Plaintiff
 Nature of Suit: 820 Copyright
 Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

LHF Productions, Inc.

represented by **Charles C. Rainey**
 Hamrick & Evans LLP
 2600 W. Olive Ave., Ste. 1020
 Burbank, CA 91505
 818-763-5292
 Fax: 888-867-5734
 Email: chaz@raineylegal.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

Defendant

John Does

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
08/26/2016	1	COMPLAINT against John Does (Filing fee \$400 receipt number 0978-4258044), filed by LHF Productions, Inc.. Proof of service due by 11/24/2016. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit EXHIBIT 1, # Charles) NOTICE of Certificate of Interested Parties requirement: Under Local Rule 7.1-1, a party must immediately file its disclosure statement with its first appearance, pleading, petition, motion, resp
08/26/2016	2	CERTIFICATE of Interested Parties filed by LHF Productions, Inc. that identifies all parties that have an interest in the outcome of this case. Other Affiliate Millenium Films, Other Affiliate G Studios, Other Affiliate Focus Features, Other Affiliate Babak Nujafi, Other Affiliate Nu Image / Millenium Films for LHF Productions, Inc. added. . (Rainey, Charles) (Entered: 08/26/2016)
08/26/2016	3	EX PARTE MOTION for Leave to take Limited Discovery Prior to Rule 26(f) Conference by Plaintiff LHF Productions, Inc.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Exhibit 1 - Declaration, # 2 Exhibit Ex
08/26/2016		Case assigned to Judge Andrew P. Gordon and Magistrate Judge Carl W. Hoffman. (ADR) (Entered: 08/26/2016)
08/26/2016	4	AO 121 - REPORT on the filing or determination of an action or appeal regarding a copyright. Mailed to the Register of Copyrights, Copyright Office. (Attachments: # 1 Complaint) (ADR) (E
09/12/2016	6	MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS of the Honorable Judge Andrew P. Gordon, on 9/12/2016. This case has been assigned to the Honorable Andrew P. Gordon. Judge Gordon's Chambers Practices, which are posted on the U.S. District Court, District of Nevada public website, may also (no image attached) (Copies have been distributed pursuant to the NEF - MAJ) (Entered: 09/12/2016)

- Getting this docket cost me .10. Very long cases will cost you more as they are more pages to it.
- The docket only shows the "reported" activity of the case. i.e. If the Troll doesn't file a dismissal for settling Does, it will not show until they do so. You can select the various documents by clicking on the number links. The cost per document is .10 per page. A 10-page Complaint will cost \$1.00.
- This is where you should be looking to see what the Troll is up to.
- It has been my experience that single-Doe cases are more likely to end in being named and served. For the multi-Doe cases, it really varies from Troll to Troll.
- The case shown above is in the early stages. The Troll has motioned the court for early discovery and I know it was granted because of the settlement letters I have seen - even though I don't see the authorization for it.
- At this time, the Troll will be hard at work trying to get people to pay a settlement.
- If you are taking the "wait and see" approach, you want to monitor the docket to see if the Troll will either 1) Request the court to authorize a deposition of the ISP subscriber (usually limited to 2-hours); 2) Amend the complaint with your true name (obtained from the ISP); 3) Ask the court to issue a summons; or 4) Summons are issued by the court.
- If any of this happens, I suggest contacting a knowledgeable attorney to discuss you options. Not all the Trolls will seek a deposition OR name and serve non-responsive Does/Defendants.
- For the Trolls that do seek a deposition, they are trying to gather more information from the ISP subscriber and hopefully find anything to force a settlement. The fact that an ISP subscriber will have to face a deposition may get them to settle – exactly what the Trolls want. Be careful at depositions – you may end up saying the wrong thing even if innocent. I have NO faith that if a deposition discloses nothing (Denial of BT use; no knowledge of anyone else running BT on the network; Open WiFi; etc.) that a Troll will dismiss a Doe.

- For the Trolls who amend the complaint and request summons, this is primarily used to bring the non-responsive Defendant to the settlement table. For a majority of these cases (my opinion), the Troll see how many people will settle after being served. Even after the 21 days have passed to file an “answer,” the Troll is unlikely to motion the court for a default judgement. Why??? Because a default judge is NOT what the Troll wants. Even getting a reduced settlement from a Defendant is preferable to getting a default judgement. How low??? It can vary, but I have seen it drop to \$1000 even after costing the Troll time and extra filings. A freely given settlement is money in their pockets, where a default award is just numbers on a court document. They still have to try and get the Defendant to pay. If the Defendant didn’t have money or other assets to cover a settlement, it is unlikely they will have it for a default damages award.
- Eventually the Troll is likely file a motion for default judgement against the “served” Defendants who failed to answer. Even if it doesn’t get them real money, it does give the false appearance of actually prosecuting these cases.

2016	10	AMENDED COMPLAINT with Jury Demand against [REDACTED] filed by QOTD Film Investment Ltd. Adds new parties. Proof of service due by [REDACTED] 2016. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Exhibit 1, # 2 Exhibit Exhibit 2)([REDACTED]) (Entered: [REDACTED] 2016)
2016	11	PROPOSED SUMMONS to be issued for [REDACTED] filed by Plaintiff QOTD Film Investment Ltd. (Attachments: # 1 Summons Summons, # 2 Summons Summons, # 3 Summons Summons, # 4 Summons Summons, # 5 Summons Summons, # 6 Summons Summons)([REDACTED]) (Entered: [REDACTED] 2016)
2016	12	Summons Issued as to [REDACTED] re 10 Amended Complaint. (ADR) (Entered: [REDACTED] 2016)

- “Served” defendants and “False Appearance”??? – Yes, just because a Troll has summon(s) issued, I have seen cases where they don’t bother to have the Defendant actually served. One case was because the Doe made it very clear to the Troll that he didn’t do it, he didn’t know who did, and he would fight them. I assume the Troll asked for the summons to look tough and maybe scare the Doe into settling.
- Even if a few Defendants “answer” the complaint, most Trolls are going to try to dismiss the case (seek the court’s permission to do so) and not enter into the “Discovery” phase. Discovery (interrogatories, depositions, records reviews, computer forensics, etc.) costs them lots in time and money. Malibu Media LLC (X-art) was previously the Troll who would enter into Discovery. Most of the other Trolls don’t bother with this. Much simpler to avoid this and start a new case with new Does.
- Remember that each case, Troll, and court is different. There is usually no simple answer of what to do. Seek out good advice and make the best choices for your situation.

DTD :)