

Judge Rules Ashley Madison Lawsuit's Plaintiffs Must Reveal Identities

[caption id="attachment_103795" align="aligncenter" width="957"]



A screenshot of Ashley Madison's website.[/caption]

The horny men of Ashley Madison can't hide in the shadows, a judge ruled this month. According to The New York Times, forty-two committed cheaters or aspiring cheaters filed a lawsuit against the popular dating website that allows married people to meet for affairs. After the July 2015 website hack, which stole the personal data of millions of users, the plaintiffs' as well as other hopeful adulterers information was released publicly.

The forty-two sought to represent a class of users, and they wanted to call themselves "John Doe" to avoid the risk of embarrassing themselves further. But Judge John A. Ross of Missouri wasn't sympathetic to their plight. He said victims of rape or child sex abuse were allowed to be anonymous, but men who are just embarrassed won't be given that same courtesy.

Judge Ross added that the plaintiffs' info was already released online after the hack so anonymity was most at this point. He also said that if they wished to represent the class, they must disclose their identities because they seek to profit more than others. They have the option of joining a class action in which they can remain anonymous but the financial incentive is less.

The possibly soon-to-be-outed John Does claimed Avid Dating Life Inc., the owner of Ashley Madison, failed to protect their personal and financial information. The site had marketed itself as a safe haven for sneaky people, with safeguards in place such as a "delete removal" service which would purge user information. However, the hack revealed that not only were users' information never removed but that the website's women were mostly fake robots, there to lure in males but incapable of delivering a sexy affair.

 $Similar\ laws uits\ were\ brought\ against\ Avid,\ and\ all\ of\ plaintiffs\ used\ their\ names,\ taking\ the\ stride\ of\ pride.$

Source: New York Times

www.jdjournal.com