

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

BROADWAY PINE BRANDS LLC,  
  
Plaintiff,

v.

SHIRO HOUSE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.

21-cv-406

(Judge Ranjan)

**PLAINTIFF’S OPPOSITION TO MOTIONS BY ASIBEIUL [D.E. 52],  
FTHOME [D.E. 51], and MARRIDON [D.E. 55]  
TO SET ASIDE CLERK’S ENTRY OF DEFAULT [DOC. NO. 35]**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Defendants Asibeul (Def. No. 6), Fthome (Def. No. 19), and Marridon (Def. No. 39) (collectively the “Moving Defendants”) – all which retained the same lawyer who has repeatedly communicated with Plaintiff’s counsel and never sought an extension to answer – now ask the Court to vacate the Clerk’s Entry of Default [D.E. 35] asserting they each have two meritorious defenses: 1) lack of personal jurisdiction and 2) service of process was improper because service was not made under the Hague Convention. Both of these so-called defenses, however, have been rejected by this Court in other online seller cases. Judge Schwab denied motions filed by ten (10) defendants through counsel to vacate a Clerk’s Entry of Default in which the defendants argued “that this Court has no personal jurisdiction over Defendants, that service was improper [as to Defendants], and that Defendants have valid defenses to this cause of action.” *Talisman Designs LLC v. Dasani*, No. 20-1084 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 13, 2020) (Schwab, J.) [D.E. 58] (copy attached as Ex. 1 to *Declaration of Stanley D. Ference III* (“*Ference Dec.*”) submitted herewith). As Judge Schwab said, “sellers on Amazon, Aliexpress, and Ebay may not avoid personal jurisdiction by

this Court on the basis that the Great Wall of China renders a district court without jurisdiction to protect brand owners from counterfeit products just like this.” *Id.* at 4. More recently, Chief Judge Hornak entered a preliminary injunction over the objection of counsel for an online seller that service was improper. *Doggie Dental, Inc. v. CDOffice*, No. 21-271 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 6, 2021) (Hornak, CJ) [D.E. 54] (relevant transcript pages attached as Ex. 2 to *Ference Dec.*). As Chief Judge Hornak said, “I do believe at this point at least, but I think generally speaking, the service that’s been authorized by an order of this court is not inconsistent with the Hague Convention in these circumstances and is otherwise fully authorized by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.” (*Id.*, Transcript Pg. 37, lines 12-16)

Broadway Pine Brands brought this case to the Court to fight the scourge of online counterfeiting and knockoffs that threaten its continued existence as a viable business. The Court has already reviewed the evidence and granted a Temporary Restraining Order [D.E. 19] and preliminary injunction [D.E. 37], thus the Plaintiff has demonstrated it is likely to succeed on the merits of the case. Moving Defendants are part of a sophisticated group of businesses that intentionally utilize the nationwide market reach of Amazon and other on-line platforms to sell their Chinese-made counterfeit and knock-off items from China into the United States and more particularly, Pennsylvania. *Complaint* [D.E. 2], p. 9, ¶ 13(b). Contrary to the assertions in their motions, the Moving Defendants intentionally offered to sell and have sold their substandard products into Pennsylvania. The product offered for sale on Amazon.com (which targets the U.S. market and consumers in Pennsylvania), was shipped into Pennsylvania (Pennsylvania sales tax was charged), was received in this Judicial District, and visually inspected to confirm that it was fake. *See Ray Dec.*<sup>1</sup> ¶ 3 and *Jelovich Dec.*<sup>2</sup> ¶ 27.

---

<sup>1</sup> Refers to the March 29, 2021 Declaration of Taylor Ray [D.E. 11].

<sup>2</sup> Refers to the March 29, 2021 Declaration Nate Jelovich [D.E. 8].

The Court also granted Broadway Pine’s Motion for Alternative Service permitting electronic service of process under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3) (hereinafter the “Alternative Service Order”). [D.E. 16] Broadway Pines electronically served all of the defendants listed on Schedule A with the Summons, Complaint, Requests for Admission, and the Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”), including the Moving Defendants, in accordance with the Alternative Service Order using the email addresses provided by the online marketplaces. [D.E. 31] Moving Defendants do not dispute the Court authorized electronic service or that they received electronic service.

The defenses of lack of personal jurisdiction and improper service of process in online seller cases are repeatedly rejected. *Mattel, Inc. v. 2012SHININGROOM2012, et al.*, Civil Action No. 18-11648 (S.D.N.Y. Sept 25, 2020) [D.E. 100] (rejecting all defenses of China-based sellers and awarding damages and attorney fees). *See also Camelbak Products, LLC v Partnerships and Unincorporated Associations Identified on Schedule “A”*, No. 20-cv-01544 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 25, 2020) [D.E. 75] (Court denied Chinese defendants’ *pro se* motions to dismiss based upon lack of personal jurisdiction, *forum non conveniens* and zero sales into jurisdiction). In the *Camelbak* case, the docket sheet merely reflects the motion was denied for the reasons stated from the bench, but the transcript provides:

With regard to personal jurisdiction, the record reflects that each of these two defendants operates an interactive website through which it offered products for sale that consumers in Illinois who have selected an address for shipping including to Illinois is an option. It's less significant that any products were actually sold to Illinois than products were offered for sale in Illinois which the record reflects they were. So for this reason and the language of certain Supreme Court cases, the defendants purposely availed themselves of the privilege of doing business in Illinois. It's also sufficient under Illinois law which allows the exercise of personal jurisdiction up to the limits of due process.

Transcript, p. 3, lines 13-25 (*Ference Dec.*, Ex. 3) The standard for personal jurisdiction in Pennsylvania is the same as in Illinois.

As lack of personal jurisdiction and improper service are waivable defenses under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12, the Court may either decline to vacate the Clerk's Entry of Default as the proffered defenses are not meritorious, or vacate the default so Moving Defendants may assert these defenses in a motion to dismiss.<sup>3</sup> Vacating the default, however, would not preclude the Court from entering a default judgment as to the other defendants, as has been done in other online seller cases.

## II. BACKGROUND

The Moving Defendants are China based sellers on the Amazon.com online marketplace who offer knock-off products for sale on an online marketplace targeting the U.S. market – including consumers in Pennsylvania and this Judicial District, advertise prices in U.S. dollars, accept payment in U.S. dollars, actually sell the advertised knock-off product to consumers in Pennsylvania and this Judicial District (collecting Pennsylvania sales tax), and ship the infringing product into Pennsylvania and this Judicial District. Without Plaintiff's authorization, the Moving Defendants used photographs of Plaintiff's products to pass off the Moving Defendants' knock-off products as Plaintiff's products. Plaintiff was able to place an order with each of the Moving Defendants to be shipped to 400 Broad Street, Suite 260, Sewickley, PA, an address within this Court's jurisdiction. A true and correct copy of the invoice for the products sold by each of the Moving Defendants (and showing Pennsylvania sales tax was collected) can be found in the Ray Dec., Composite Ex. 1 [D.E. 11] and is attached to this response as **Exhibit A**.

Each of the Moving Defendants has consistently tried to hide its true identify. In fact, to date, the evidence shows that each Moving Defendant has used multiple emails, multiple names, and different addresses. The information in the pro se motions submitted by each Moving Defendant is contradicted by the information each Moving Defendant provided to Amazon and

---

<sup>3</sup> By failing to proffer any other defenses, each Moving Defendant is now estopped from raising any other defenses than the two defenses proffered in the present motion.

raises serious concerns about the veracity of the statements being made to the Court. The chart below summarizes the different email, alias and addresses each Moving Defendant has reported:

Source	Amazon Store	Email	Name	Address
Amazon	ASIBEIUL	zhang889huan@outlook.com	Guangzhou Shi Asibei Maoyi Youxian Gongsi	Tianhe Qu Kemulang Xincun Dongjie 9 Hao Zibian 2 Lou A03, Guangzhou Shi, Guangdong, 510620 CN
Defendant's Motion [52]	ASIBEIUL	lihanaokey@foxmail.com	Li Han	301, Jinqiao Garden, Donghuan 1st Road, Longhua District, Shenzhen, China
Amazon	FTHOME	lihongtmwl@sina.com	ShenZhenShiTimo WangLuoKeJiYou XianGongSi	ShenZhenShiFuTianQuShaTouJieDao TianAnSheQuShenNanDaDao 6015HaoBenYuanDaSha4A shenzhenshi guangdong 518000 CN
Defendant's Motion [51]	FTHOME	2162928642@qq.com	Liu Li Hong	4A, Benyuan building, Tian'an community, Futian District, Shenzhen, China
Amazon	MARRIDON	XLiKejiaddJJJ@aliyun.com	ShenZHENSHIHUIKEJ IADIANZISHANGWU YOUXIANGONGS	ShenZHENSHILOGNHUAQU LONGHUAJIEDAOQINGHUSHEQU XUEGANGBEILU306HAOSHENGLI GONGYEYUANAdong101 shenZHENSHI GUANGDONGSHENG 457001 CN
Defendant's Motion [55]	MARRIDON	chenhuac@yeah.net	Xie Li Xin	101, building A, Shengli Industrial Park, Qinghu community, Longhua District, Shenzhen, China

This information was obtained from Amazon in response to the Temporary Restraining Order. *See Ference Dec.* at ¶ 5. Furthermore, Plaintiff even searched each of the addresses provided by the Moving Defendants through leading US and China online map services and could not find a matching location on any maps. *Id.* at ¶¶ 6-9. The US map service shows the location cannot be found or a partial match was found; the Chinese map service cannot match a location with address provided either. *Id.* In short, the identifying information each of the Moving Defendants has provided is fake.

A lawyer representing Moving Defendants contacted Plaintiff's counsel on April 14, 2021, as a result of a communication sent by Amazon and Plaintiff sent the notice of the lawsuit and a link to

the documents to their lawyer on April 19, 2021. *Id.* at ¶¶ 10-11. Moving Defendants had plenty of notice and time to file answers prior to the entry of default and neither Moving Defendant nor their lawyer ever sought an extension to file an answer. Although Moving Defendants' motions state they are proceeding *pro se*, Moving Defendants have been continuously represented by the same attorney in China throughout this proceeding. *Id.*

### III. ARGUMENT

There are four factors to determine if good cause has been shown to set aside the Clerk's entry of default. These factors are: (1) prejudice to the plaintiff; (2) whether defendant has *prima facie* meritorious defense; (3) whether defaulting defendant's conduct is excusable or culpable; and (4) effectiveness of alternative sanctions. *Gross v. Stereo Component Sys., Inc.*, 700 F.2d 120 (3d Cir. 1983). The second factor — whether the defendant has a meritorious defense — is considered to be a threshold question. *United States v. \$55,518.05 in U.S. Currency*, 728 F.2d 192 (3d Cir. 1984). Moreover, there is no point in setting aside a default when an additional opportunity to present a defense would be futile. *Id.* That is the case before the Court in these motions.

#### **A. This Court has Personal Jurisdiction over the Moving Defendants because they Targeted Pennsylvania and the United States.**

The evidence submitted in support of Plaintiff's request for a temporary restraining order shows that the Moving Defendants operated an interactive website through which they offered products for sale to consumers in Pennsylvania, and actually shipped infringing product into Pennsylvania. **Exhibit A** hereto, excerpted from *Ray Dec.*, Composite Exhibit 1 [D.E. 11].

In the *Talisman Designs* case discussed above, Judge Schwab denied motions filed by multiple sellers on Amazon to set aside the Clerk's Entry of Default where the moving defendants raised lack of personal jurisdiction as a meritorious defense. *Talisman Designs LLC v. Dasani*, No. 20-1084 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 13, 2020) (Schwab, J.) [D.E. 58] (*Ference Dec.*, Ex. 1). In addressing the personal jurisdiction, Judge Schwab stated:

The primary defense of Defendants is that this Court lack personal jurisdiction over them. This defense is without merit. The three-part test to determine personal jurisdiction, as set forth in *Budget Blinds, Inc. v. White*, 536 F.2d 244, 260 (3d Cir. 2008) is as follows: (1) the nonresident defendant must do some act or consummate some transaction with the forum or perform some act by which he purposefully avails himself of the privilege of conducting activities in the forum, thereby invoking the benefits and protections of its laws; (2) the claim must be one which arises out of or results from the defendant's form-related activities; and, (3) exercise of jurisdiction must be reasonable. **All three parts of this test have been met in this case as to Defendants.**

*Id.* at 4 (emphasis added). Judge Schwab in the not only Judge in this district to find personal jurisdiction over an online seller based in China who sells into Pennsylvania and this judicial district.<sup>4</sup>

Other courts which have considered this issue have also found they have personal jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Monster Energy Company v. Chen Wensheng, et al.*, 136 F. Supp. 3d 987, 909 (“defendants' offers to sell counterfeit Monster Energy Products on their Internet stores constitute tortious activity committed in Illinois sufficient to establish personal jurisdiction”); *Conair Corp., et al. v. Chen Xin, et al.*, No. 16-cv-9693 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 22, 2017) (D.E. 69) (same); *Christian Dior Couture, S.A. v. Lei Liu et al.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 158225, at \*6 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 17, 2015) (same). Indeed, last year the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit reversed the District Court's dismissal of a case for lack of personal jurisdiction arising from commerce over the Internet. *Curry v. Revolution Labs., LLC*, 949 F.3d 385, 399 (7th Cir. 2020).

---

<sup>4</sup> *See also See, e.g., Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Belvia*, No. 20-cv-284 (April 21, 2020)(Schwab, J)(sellers on amazon.com); *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Abigail*, No. 19-cv-503 (May 28, 2019) (Fischer, J.) (sellers on amazon.com); *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Babymove*, No. 19-cv-166 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 14, 2019) (Fischer, J.) (sellers on amazon.com); *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Artifacts\_Selling*, No. 18-cv-1462 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 31, 2018) (Fischer, J.); *Doggie Dental, Inc. v. Ahui*, No. 19-cv-1627 (W.D. Pa. Dec. 12, 2019)(Hornak, J.)(sellers on amazon.com); *Gorge Designs v Accesssmall, et al.*, No 19-1454 (W.D. Pa.)(Stickman, J)(sellers on Aliexpress.com and eBay.com); *Doggie Dental Inc. v. Go Well*, No. 19-cv-1282 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 11, 2019) (Hornak, J.) (sellers on amazon.com); *Doggie Dental Inc. v. Worthbuyer*, No. 19-cv-1283 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 11, 2019) (Hornak, J.) (sellers on ebay.com); *Doggie Dental Inc. v. Max\_Buy*, No. 19-cv-746 (W.D. Pa. June 27, 2019) (Hornak, J.) (sellers on ebay.com); *Doggie Dental Inc. v. Anywill*, No. 19-cv-682 (W.D. Pa. June 13, 2019) (Hornak, J.)

The Northern District of Illinois has held a court can properly exercise jurisdiction over a China-based infringer, even if the infringer has no physical presence in the United States:

Mori Lee has offered evidence tending to show that weddirect.co, though not physically located in Illinois or even in the United States, operated an interactive website through which it offered products for sale to consumers, including consumers located in Illinois, who would then select an address where the products should be shipped, including Illinois as one of the options. This is enough to amount to weddirect.co having purposefully availed itself of doing business in Illinois. See [*Curry*, 949 F.3d] at 399. Because Mori Lee's claims against weddirect.co are related to contacts of this type, personal jurisdiction exists over weddirect.co in a court located in Illinois. Nor, as in *Curry*, is it unfair to subject weddirect.co to jurisdiction here. For these reasons, the Court denies weddirect.co's motion to dismiss for lack of person jurisdiction [42] and directs it to file an answer to the complaint by no later than 6/4/2020.

*Mori Lee v. Lei Liu et al.*, No. 19-cv-07555 (N.D. Ill. May 14, 2020) [D.E. 60] (the case settled after the decision denying the motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction).

Each of the Moving Defendants is also subject to jurisdiction pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(k)(2). Rule 4(k)(2) provides for personal jurisdiction through nationwide service of process over any defendant provided that: (1) the plaintiff's claims are based on federal law; (2) no state court could exercise jurisdiction over the defendants; (3) the exercise of jurisdiction is consistent with the laws of the United States; and (4) the exercise of jurisdiction is consistent with the Constitution.

*Cent. States, Southeast and Sw. Areas Pension Fund v. Reimer Express World Corp.*, 230 F.3d 934, 940 (7th Cir. 2000). Because the Moving Defendants intentionally and knowingly offered for sale, sold, and shipped product to United States residents, personal jurisdiction is also proper under Rule 4(k)(2). See *Plixer Int'l v. Scrutinizer GmbH*, 905 F.3d 1, 5 (1st Cir. 2018).

Moving Defendants cannot hide behind their absence in the United States to avoid being held accountable for the harm they have caused in the United States. Defendants must come to the United States and stand accountable for their conduct. *Christian Dior Couture, S.A. v. Lei Liu et al.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 158225, at \*13 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 17, 2015). By conducting business in the United States, each of the Moving Defendants "certainly should not be surprised by the

jurisdictional consequences of [its] actions” given that it had sufficient resources to purposefully avail itself of the Pennsylvania market. *Id.* at \*14 (quoting *Hemi Grp., LLC*, 622 F.3d at 758). As such, each of the Moving Defendants should have reasonably foreseen being subjected to jurisdiction in Pennsylvania. *See Exact Mktg. v. Unique Sports Prods.*, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123316, at \*5-6 (D. Utah July 20, 2018) (In this case, Hot Glove's purposeful partnerships with its online nationwide retailers such as Amazon.com, Walmart.com and others, establish its intent and expectation to benefit from national sales including in Utah.”).

### **B. Service by Email was Proper**

Moving Defendants argue service by email and without Chinese translations attached do not conform to the Hague Convention. This is not correct and has been previously briefed by Plaintiff in its Motion for an Order authorizing Alternative Service [D.E. 12]. As noted therein, service by email is permissible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3) (pgs. 8-14) and is not prohibited by any international agreements (including the Hague Convention) (pgs. 15-17). Service by email was proper because it conforms with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3), was approved by Court Order and the Moving Defendants acknowledge receiving the relevant documents by email service (ASIBEIUL p. 1 of motion describes communicating with Plaintiff to discuss the lawsuit; FTHOME p. 1 of motion discusses consulting with lawyers in China to discuss the current lawsuit; MARRIDON p. 2 of motion discusses consulting a local lawyer).

In entering a preliminary injunction over counsel’s objection of improper service under the Hague Convention, Judge Hornak said:

I suspect, truth be told, many people, perhaps even some [in this hearing] do not know what is in their physical mailbox on any given day, and in fact, based on the stack of stuff I've seen in lobbies of apartment buildings that I visited, it appears there's a lot of people that don't know what's in their mailbox or next to it, but we all, I suspect, have experiences in our lives where we have been in the middle of a conversation with somebody, perhaps being at a theater with them, sharing a meal, whether it's at a restaurant or in the home and we all know what happens. We hear a vibration somewhere and somebody picks their phone up and looks at it.

Isn't, in the year 2021, if the law said to me, Judge Hornak, draw an analogy. Isn't electronic service in the hyper-connected world in which we live far more akin to personal physical service than it is to postal mail? There are people that don't even have a mailbox at their residence. They have it at the post office. They maybe go down once a week. They travel. They have the luxury of not being on the road a lot. They like to be on the road. They don't have their physical mail forwarded. It sits in a box.

But in their back pocket, in their -- I'm an old person -- belt holster, somewhere else, they have their phone. I happen to have an iPhone 8. Others have different things. I see that in realtime, much like a person walking in and handing me what I'm seeing on the phone.

(*Ference Dec.*, Ex. 3, p. 14, line 24 – p. 15, line 24)

Moreover, the Hague Convention is not applicable "where the address of the person to be served with the document is not known." *Bravetti v. Liu*, Civil Action No. 3:12-cv-7492-MAS-TJB, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 175060, at \*8 (D.N.J. Dec. 11, 2013). In the present case, the names and addresses of the Moving Defendants are effectively unknown as they have supplied names and addresses to Amazon that are different from the names and addresses listed in their current motions and are not complete mailing or street addresses.

To comport with Due Process requirements, the method of service must be "reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections." *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950). In this case, service by email was reasonably calculated to apprise the parties of the pendency of the action because the Moving Defendants conducted their business on Amazon.com using only email addresses, and in fact, did provide notice.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court deny the motion by the Moving Defendants to set aside the Clerk's Entry of Default.

Dated: June 11, 2021

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES LLC  
409 Broad Street  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143  
(412) 741-8400 - Telephone  
(412) 741-9292 - Facsimile

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Stanley D. Ference III  
Stanley D. Ference III  
Pa. ID No. 59899  
[courts@ferencelaw.com](mailto:courts@ferencelaw.com)

Brian Samuel Malkin  
Pa. ID No. 70448  
[bmalkin@ferencelaw.com](mailto:bmalkin@ferencelaw.com)

# **EXHIBIT A**

**Seller Display Name**

**Asibeiu**

**Seller ID**

**A2P9NBU7XCCOFQ**

Deliver to Sewickley 15143 All

Hello, brian Account Returns & Orders 0

All brian's Amazon.com Best Sellers Customer Service Sell Browsing History Prime Video Prime Shop Black-owned businesses

Your Account > Your Orders > Order Details

# Order Details

Ordered on February 26, 2021 Order# 111-6821506-4805057

View or Print invoice

### Shipping Address

██████████  
409 BROAD ST STE 260  
SEWICKLEY, PA 15143-1558  
United States

Change

### Apply gift card balance

Enter code  
Apply

### Order Summary

Item(s) Subtotal:	\$19.99
Shipping & Handling:	\$0.99
Total before tax:	\$20.98
Estimated tax to be collected:	\$1.26
<b>Grand Total:</b>	<b>\$22.24</b>

[See tax and seller information](#)

[Transactions](#)

### Arriving Apr 9 - May 5



**TONGHANG** Girls Flower Floor Pillow, Seating Cushion for Kids, Soft Plush Reading Pillow, Girls & Boys Seating Pad for Reading Nook, Bed Room,Watching TV (1pcs,Blue)

Sold by: Asibeiu

\$19.99

Condition: New

Buy it again

Track package

Problem with order

Change Payment Method

Change shipping speed

Cancel items

Archive order

### Related to items in this order

Page 1 of 6



**ECR4Kids** Flower Floor Pillow, Seating Cushion for Kids' Bedrooms, Reading Nooks, Playrooms,...

17

\$39.99



**BESPORTBLE** Heart Shape Makeup Mirror Cosmetic Mirror Desktop Mirror Wall Hanging Mirror Bedroom...

7

1 offer from \$29.99



**4M** 40 LED Battery Powered Fairy String Light, Five-Pointed Star String Lights for...

2,175

\$9.99



**Cozy Line Home Fashions** Pink Butterfly Shaped Decorative Pillow

127

\$25.99



Back to top

**Seller Display Name**

**Fthome**

**Seller ID**

**A2UDVIVQQ2SWXG**

Hello  
Select your address All ▾

Hello, brian Returns  
Account ▾ & Orders 0

All brian's Amazon.com Best Sellers Customer Service Sell Browsing History ▾ Buy Again Prime Video Shop Black-owned businesses

Your Account > Your Orders > Order Details

# Order Details

Ordered on February 24, 2021 Order# 112-0572840-4619459

[View or Print invoice](#)

<b>Shipping Address</b> [Redacted] 409 BROAD ST STE 260 SEWICKLEY, PA 15143-1558 United States <input type="button" value="Change"/>	<b>Payment Method</b> [Redacted] <input type="button" value="Change"/>	<b>Apply gift card balance</b> <input type="text" value="Enter code"/> <input type="button" value="Apply"/>	<b>Order Summary</b> Item(s) Subtotal: \$19.99 Shipping & Handling: \$6.00 Total before tax: \$25.99 Estimated tax to be collected: \$1.56 <b>Grand Total: \$27.55</b> <a href="#">See tax and seller information</a>
---	--	---	---

[Transactions](#)

**Arriving Mar 8 - Mar 18**

Flower Floor Pillow Seating Cushion, for a Reading Nook, Bed Room, or Watching TV. Softer and More Plush Than Area Rug or Foam Mat (Blue)  
 Sold by: Fthome  
**\$19.99**  
 Condition: New

## Related to items in this order

Page 1 of 5

 Indie Room Decor Aesthetic Collage Kit for Wall - Covers 15 Square Feet - Unique Indie... 112 <b>\$29.99</b>	 Cabilock David Statue Flower Vase Furniture Sculpture Brushes Holder Resin Head Cement... 1 <b>\$16.65</b>	 Girls Flower Floor Pillow Seating Cushion, for a Reading Nook, Bed Room, or Watching TV. Softer... 2,411 <b>\$49.99</b>	 JACK MEETS KATE Indie Room Decor for Teen Girls, Room Decor For Bedroom Aesthetic, Photo Wall... 14 <b>\$21.98</b>
--	--	---	--

## Inspired by your browsing history

**Seller Display Name**

**Marridon**

**Seller ID**

**A28IZYH4T3DAHC**

Hello [Select your address](#) All ▾

Hello, brian [Account](#) ▾ [Returns & Orders](#) 0

All [brian's Amazon.com](#) [Best Sellers](#) [Customer Service](#) [Sell](#) [Browsing History](#) ▾ [Prime Video](#) [Prime](#) ▾ [Shop Black-owned businesses](#)

[Your Account](#) > [Your Orders](#) > [Order Details](#)

# Order Details

Ordered on February 26, 2021 Order# 113-0450133-7992233

[View or Print invoice](#)

<b>Shipping Address</b> [Redacted] 409 BROAD ST STE 260 SEWICKLEY, PA 15143-1558 United States <a href="#">Change</a>	<b>Payment Method</b> [Redacted] <a href="#">Change</a>	<b>Apply gift card balance</b> <input type="text" value="Enter code"/> <input type="button" value="Apply"/>	<b>Order Summary</b> Item(s) Subtotal: \$25.99 Shipping & Handling: \$5.00 Total before tax: \$30.99 Estimated tax to be collected: \$1.86 <b>Grand Total: \$32.85</b> <a href="#">See tax and seller information</a>
<a href="#">Transactions</a>			

## Arriving Mar 19 - Mar 30



Flower Cushion Pillow Seat Girls Flower Shaped Floor Pillow Seating Cushion Thick Plush for a Reading Nook, Bed Room, or Watching TV. Indoor and Outdoor Decoration (Blue, 19" Diameter)

Sold by: [Marridon](#)  
\$25.99

Condition: New

[Buy it again](#)

[Track package](#)

[Problem with order](#)

[Change Payment Method](#)

[Change shipping speed](#)

[Cancel items](#)

[Archive order](#)

## Related to items in this order

Page 1 of 6



HearthSong Secret Garden Hideaway Canopy with Ribbons, Flower Canopy, and Nylon Tie-Backs, 7'H...

47

\$34.98



Cabilock David Statue Flower Vase Furniture Sculpture Brushes Holder Resin Head Cement...

1

\$16.65



Indie Room Decor Aesthetic Collage Kit for Wall - Covers 15 Square Feet - Unique Indie...

122

\$29.99



Girls Flower Floor Pillow Seating Cushion, for a Reading Nook, Bed Room, or Watching TV. Softer...

389

\$49.99



## Inspired by your browsing history