

03/05/2026	13	<p>District Judge Margaret R. Guzman: ELECTRONIC ORDER entered denying 11 Motion for Protective Order. The motion for protective order [ECF No. 11] is DENIED. As articulated by the Plaintiff, "[t]he United States is not a party in this case, has not moved to intervene, and has not sought to join the case by any other mechanism." [ECF No. 12 at 3] Accordingly, the motion is not properly before this Court. Further, Defendant Agent Doe has not met his burden of rebutting the "strong presumption" against proceeding by pseudonym. <u>Doe v. Massachusetts Inst. of Tech.</u>, 46 F.4th 61, 73 (1st Cir. 2022). There is no declaration from the Defendant Agent himself indicating that he authorized the United States' motion, nor is there an affidavit from the Agent articulating the specific safety concerns he is facing that require anonymity. <u>See id.</u> ("In most cases, the district court should require a declaration or affidavit either by the moving party or by someone with special knowledge who can speak to the need for anonymity in that case." (citation omitted)). Additionally, the United States' motion is problematic due to the permanency of the request for anonymity, which does not have any expiration clause. Should Agent Doe seek to proceed by pseudonym, he may file his own, properly supported motion, or the United States may seek entrance into this case through appropriate procedural means. (SF) (Entered: 03/05/2026)</p>
------------	----	---