

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO

Jane Doe and Daughter Doe v. Ursuline High School, et al.

Jane Doe and Daughter Doe · No. 4:25-CV-01895 · Decided November 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio orders the plaintiffs to proceed pseudonymously because the case involves allegations of minor sexual assault and significant privacy and safety concerns. The court requires disclosure of the plaintiffs' identities under seal, directs future filings to use Jane Doe and Daughter Doe, and sets deadlines for amended pleadings and related disclosures.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Benita Y. Pearson
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio
DECIDED	November 24, 2025
DOCKET	4:25-CV-01895
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Order resolving Plaintiffs' request to proceed under pseudonyms and Defendants' motion for an extension of time to answer.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercised discretion to determine whether Plaintiffs' privacy interests outweighed the public interest in open judicial proceedings and potential prejudice to the opposing parties.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Jane Doe and Daughter Doe v. Ursuline High School, et al.

TOPICS

civil procedure

pleadings

motion to amend

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

education law

privacy and pseudonymous litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiffs should be permitted to proceed under pseudonyms because their privacy and safety interests outweigh the public interest in disclosure and any potential prejudice to Defendants.
2. What procedural disclosures and caption amendments should be required when Plaintiffs are permitted to proceed pseudonymously.
3. Whether Defendants' motion for an extension of time to answer should be granted after the court ordered amendment of the complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs may proceed pseudonymously because the important privacy interests associated with allegations of minor sexual assault and the protection of a minor outweigh the public interest in disclosure and any potential prejudice to Defendants.
2. Plaintiffs must disclose their identities to the court and Defendants under seal, use the caption Jane Doe and Daughter Doe rather than the chosen pseudonym Chef, keep the identities confidential absent court permission, provide a pseudonym key for minor Defendants, and amend the complaint to identify known Defendants subject to the stated privacy protections.
3. Defendants' Motion for Extension of Time to Answer was denied as moot.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“District courts thus have discretion to issue protective orders for anonymized pleadings when they find an important privacy interest that outweighs both the public interest in free disclosure and any potential prejudice to other parties.” (Discussion)

“Plaintiffs shall proceed pseudonymously and disclose their identities to the Court and all Defendants under seal no later than December 1, 2025.” (Conclusion)

“The Parties shall not disclose Plaintiffs’ identities without leave of Court.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action involves allegations of minor sexual assault and includes a minor Plaintiff and her guardian. Plaintiffs asserted that public identification could cause emotional harm, retaliation, and additional trauma from placing their names and intimate details in the public record. The court found that proceeding under pseudonyms would not impair Plaintiffs' ability to prosecute their claims or Defendants' ability to defend.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed a federal civil-rights action concerning allegations of minor sexual assault and sought to proceed anonymously. The court granted pseudonymous treatment, ordered disclosures and amendment of the complaint, and denied Defendants' motion for an extension of time to answer as moot because the amended pleading created a new response calendar.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Samad v. Jenkins, 845 F.2d 660, 663 (6th Cir. 1988)
- Porter, 370 F.3d at 561
- Koe v. U. Hosp's. Health Sys., Inc., No. 22-3952, 2024 WL 1048184, at *2 (6th Cir. Mar. 8, 2024)
- Doe v. Megless, 654 F.3d 404, 408 (3d Cir. 2011)
- Doe v. St. Edward High Sch., No. 22-CV-440, 2022 WL 2717018, at *3-*4 (N.D. Ohio July 13, 2022)
- K.S. v. Detroit Pub. Schs., 14-12214, 2015 WL 13358204 (E.D. Mich. July 22, 2015)
- Doe v. Neverson, 820 F. App'x 984, 987-88 (11th Cir. 2020)
- Doe v. Cabrera, 307 F.R.D. 1, 5 (D.D.C. 2014)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ohio-united-states-district-court-for-the/2025/jane-doe-and-daughter-doe-v-ursuline-high-school-et-al-s976q3bi>