

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

VALERIE PLAME WILSON, ET AL.

Plaintiffs,

v.

I. LEWIS LIBBY, JR., ET AL.

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 06-1258 (JDB)

ORDER

On August 11, 2006, plaintiffs filed a motion seeking relief from the requirements of Local Civil Rules 5.1(e)(1) and 11.1 -- that is, for leave to proceed without disclosing their full residential address -- or, alternatively, leave to file their residential address with the Clerk of the Court under seal, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5.1(j). Although proof of service of the complaint has not been filed and no defendant has entered an appearance in this action, plaintiffs' represent that they served each defendant, through counsel, with a copy of the motion and that counsel for defendant Richard Cheney "does not oppose the relief requested." As of this date, no defendant has filed an opposition to the motion.

Plaintiffs ask that, "[o]ut of respect for [their] privacy in light of their public visibility," Pls.' Mot. at 1, they be excused from complying with rules requiring that each party to a civil action include his or her full residential address in the caption of the "first filing by or on behalf of" the party. See L. Civ. R. 5.1(e)(1), 11.1. This Court does not readily grant relief from the ordinary application of such rules, nor does the Court believe that a plaintiff's mere invocation of

privacy interests and public prominence, without more, warrants an exception to rules that apply to all other litigants. Moreover, the implicit premise of plaintiffs' motion -- that their residential address is confidential -- is questionable. In less than thirty minutes, the Court was able to ascertain plaintiffs' residential address from multiple publicly available sources, including a database of federal government records. Indeed, an attorney who filed this motion on plaintiffs' behalf has stated in a nationally circulated newspaper that he is plaintiffs' next-door neighbor, and the residential address of that attorney also is readily ascertainable. Based on the current record, then, the relief plaintiffs seek is not warranted.

Accordingly, it is this 24th day of August, 2006, hereby

ORDERED that plaintiffs shall, by not later than September 11, 2006, comply with the requirements of Local Civil Rules 5.1(e)(1) and 11.1.

/s/ John D. Bates
JOHN D. BATES
United States District Judge

Copies to:¹

Anne L. Weismann
Melanie Togman Sloan
CITIZENS FOR RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICS
1400 Eye Street, NW, Suite 450
Washington, DC 20005
Email: aweismann@citizensforethics.org
Email: msloan@citizensforethics.org

¹ Because there are no counsel of record for defendants, the Court will transmit copies of this order to the attorneys identified in the certificate of service accompanying plaintiffs' motion.

Erwin Chemerinsky
DUKE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW
Science Drive and Towerview Road
Durham, NC 27708-0360

Counsel for plaintiffs

Alex Bourelly
BAKER BOTTS LLP
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004-2400

Robert D. Luskin
PATTON BOGGS LLP
2550 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Emmet T. Flood
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Counsel for defendants