

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

---

CHEVRON CORP.,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Case No. 1:12-mc-65 LAK

Hon. Lewis A. Kaplan

STEVEN DONZIGER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**JOHN DOE MOVANTS' RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

## I. INTRODUCTION

This Court should not compel the John Doe Non-Party Movants to reveal their true identities under seal to the Court at this time. As an initial matter, the very constitutional right the Does seek to protect is the freedom from compelled identification by the government. *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm'n*, 514 U.S. 334, 342 (1995) (“An author’s decision to remain anonymous . . . is an aspect of freedom of speech protected by the First Amendment.”); *see also Talley v. California*, 362 U.S. 60, 65 (1960) (“There are times and circumstances when States may not compel members of groups engaged in the dissemination of ideas to be publicly identified.”). Moreover, the Court can adjudicate this dispute fairly and efficiently without requiring the Does to identify themselves under seal.

## II. ARGUMENT

The Court has suggested that Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 10(a) weighs in favor of requiring the Does to identify themselves to the Court under seal. The Court has specifically expressed concern about the policies underlying the rule and former adjudication considerations. These principles do not require the Court to order the Does to submit their identities under seal at this time.

First, the caption on the Doe’s Motion to Quash complies with the letter of Rule 10(a), which requires that every pleading include the names of the parties to the action. The Does’ Motion lists the plaintiff, the lead defendant, and refers generally to the other defendants in compliance with Rule 10(a). None of the John Doe Movants are parties to Chevron’s lawsuit against Mr. Donziger and his associates, so they fall outside the four corners of Rule 10(a).

Second, requiring the Does to identify themselves to the Court would not further the policies underlying Rule 10(a). The primary purpose of the rule “is to apprise parties of who their opponents are and to protect the public’s legitimate interest in knowing the facts at issue in court proceedings.” *Doe v. Shakur*, 164 F.R.D. 359, 360 (S.D.N.Y. 1996). Here, Chevron knows the identities of all the defendants it named in its lawsuit. Chevron also asserts that it knows the identities of the Does. Chevron Corporation’s Mem. of Law in Opp. to Mot. of Non-Party John

Doe Movants to Quash Subpoena to Microsoft, Inc. Seeking Identity and Email Usage Information at 4-5 (ECF No. 35).

In the Second Circuit, when faced with a party who wishes to remain anonymous, courts must balance the plaintiff's "interest in proceeding anonymously against the interests of defendants and the public." *Sealed Plaintiff v. Sealed Defendant*, 537 F.3d 185, 190-91 (2d Cir. 2008) (examining several non-exclusive factors including "whether the injury litigated against would be incurred as a result of the disclosure of the plaintiff's identity"); *Doe v. United Services Life Ins. Co.*, 123 F.R.D. 437 (S.D.N.Y. 1988) (plaintiff allowed to proceed under pseudonym where insurer already knew plaintiff's true identity and would not be disadvantaged by allowing him to proceed under pseudonym). Should the Court ultimately deny the Does' Motion to Quash, Chevron will have the Does' identities. But at this juncture, neither Chevron nor the public has any identifiable interest in requiring the Does to identify themselves, *ex parte* and under seal, to the Court.

Third, the rules of former adjudication do not present a problem at this time. The Court may be concerned that individuals who have lost prior disputes in this litigation are now attempting to re-litigate identical issues as Does rather than under their true names, which might be barred by *res judicata*. But Chevron asserts that it knows the Does' identities already, and has not claimed that they are trying to re-litigate any issues. Furthermore, if Chevron prevails on the Does' Motion to Quash, it will have the identities of the Does and will be able to argue in the future based on *res judicata* that the same non-parties may not re-litigate the same issue. If the Does prevail, they clearly have Chevron's identity as well as their own, and will be similarly well situated to argue based on *res judicata*.

Finally, the Court has noted that it does not know the true names of the Does who submitted declarations in support of the Does' Motion to Quash, which could impede prosecution of those individuals if there were ever reason to believe that the declarations are

false.<sup>1</sup> Counsel for the Does have on file copies of both declarations submitted in support of the Does' Motion to Quash signed with the declarants' true names and signatures. Declaration of Michelle Harrison in Support of John Doe Movants' Response to Order to Show Cause at ¶ 4. No party has suggested that the declarations contain false statements or are otherwise suspect. Should any such concern arise, the Court could order the Does to submit the declarations signed with their true names at that time.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should not order the John Doe Movants to submit affidavits or declarations revealing to the Court their true identities. In the alternative, the Court should defer issuing any such order until after deciding the Motion to Quash, should the need for identification arise.

DATED: February 6, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mitchell L. Stoltz

Mitchell L. Stoltz, Esq.

(Bar Roll No. 517844)

Marcia Hofmann, Esq.

(admitted *pro hac vice*)

Nathan Cardozo, Esq.

ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION

454 Shotwell Street

San Francisco, CA 94110

Telephone: (415) 436-9333

Marco Simons, Esq.

marco@earthrights.org

EARTHRIGHTS INTERNATIONAL

1612 K Street NW, Suite 401

Washington, DC 20006

Telephone: (202) 466-5188

*Counsel for Non-Party John Doe Movants*

---

<sup>1</sup> While the Court's Order to Show Cause expressed this concern only about the declaration filed with the Motion to Quash, the Does have since filed a second declaration in support of the motion at ECF No. 42-2.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

---

CHEVRON CORP.,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Case No. 1:12-mc-65 LAK

Hon. Lewis A. Kaplan

STEVEN DONZIGER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**DECLARATION OF MICHELLE HARRISON IN SUPPORT OF  
JOHN DOE MOVANTS' RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

1. I, Michelle Harrison, have personal knowledge of all matters set forth in this declaration. If called upon to do so, I could and would testify to all matters set forth herein.

2. I am a law clerk with EarthRights International, counsel of record for Non-Party John Doe Movants.

3. EarthRights International and the Electronic Frontier Foundation represent the owners of the Microsoft email accounts [simeontegel@hotmail.com](mailto:simeontegel@hotmail.com), [mey\\_1802@hotmail.com](mailto:mey_1802@hotmail.com), [pirancha@hotmail.com](mailto:pirancha@hotmail.com), and [duruti@hotmail.com](mailto:duruti@hotmail.com).

4. Two of our clients have submitted declarations to the Court that are signed using only their email addresses, which are [simeontegel@hotmail.com](mailto:simeontegel@hotmail.com) and [pirancha@hotmail.com](mailto:pirancha@hotmail.com). A copy of each declaration with the account holders' true names and signatures are on file with this office.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on February 5, 2013.



---

MICHELLE C. HARRISON

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

---

CHEVRON CORP.,

Plaintiff,

-against-

Case No. 1:12-mc-65 lk/CFH

Hon. Lewis A. Kaplan

STEVEN DONZIGER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on February 6, 2013, I electronically filed JOHN DOE MOVANTS' RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE and DECLARATION OF MICHELLE HARRISON IN SUPPORT OF JOHN DOE MOVANTS' RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE with the Clerk of the District Court using the CM/ECF system, which sent notification of such filing to the following:

Randy M. Mastro  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP  
200 Park Avenue, 47th Floor  
New York, NY 10166-0193  
Tel: 212-351-4000  
Fax: 212-351-5219  
Email: rmastro@gibsondunn.com

Paul DerOhannesian, II  
DEROHANNESIAN &  
DEROHANNESIAN  
677 Broadway, Suite 202  
Albany, NY 12207  
Tel: 518-465-6420  
Fax: 518-427-0614  
Email: derolaw@verizon.net

Howard S. Hogan  
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036-5306  
Tel: (202) 955-8500  
Fax: (202) 467-0539  
Email: hhogan@gibsondunn.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Chevron Corporation*

Craig Smyser  
Larry R. Veselka  
SMYSER KAPLAN & VESELKA, L.L.P.  
Bank of America Center  
700 Louisiana Street, Suite 2300  
Houston, TX 77002  
Tel: 713-221-2300  
Fax: 713-221-2320  
Email: csmyser@skv.com  
Email: lveselka@skv.com

John W. Kecker  
Jan Nielsen Little  
Matthew M. Werdegar  
KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP  
633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415)-391-5400  
Fax: (415)-397-7188

Email: jkeker@kvn.com  
Email: jlittle@kvn.com  
Email: mwerdegar@kvn.com

Justin W. Gray  
MAYNARD, O'CONNOR, SMITH &  
CATALINOTTO, LLP  
6 Tower Place  
Albany, NY 12203  
Tel: 518-465-3553  
Fax: 518-465-5845  
Email: gray@maynardoconnorlaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Steven Donziger,  
The Law Offices of Steven R. Donziger,  
Donziger & Associates, PLLC, Javier  
Piaguaje Payaguaje, and Hugo Gerardo  
Camacho Naranjo*

And, I hereby certify that I have mailed by the United States Postal Service the document to the following non-CM/ECF Participants:

Microsoft Corporation  
c/o Corporation Service Company  
80 State Street  
Albany, NY 12207  
Brien Jacobsen <brienj@microsoft.com>

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on

February 6, 2013.



Stephanie Shattuck  
Legal Secretary  
On behalf of:  
Mitchell L. Stoltz, Esq.  
Marcia Hofmann, Esq.  
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION  
454 Shotwell Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110  
Telephone: (415) 436-9333  
Facsimile: (415) 436-9993  
*Counsel for John Doe Movants*