

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

MSR IMPORTS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GLOBAL GOODS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 23-2133

**(Chief Judge Hornak)**

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT AND  
PERMANENT INJUNCTION**

Plaintiff submits this Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Default Judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55 (b)(2) seeking entry of Judgment against the defaulting Defendants (“Defendants”) on all Counts of the Complaint.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This memorandum is filed in support of the lawsuit (as set forth in the caption above) that the Plaintiff brought seeking relief from the tireless efforts of the online copycats trying to destroy Plaintiff’s business.

In this case, Defendants are sellers of infringing products on at least one of the online marketplaces operated by Aliexpress.com, Amazon.com, eBay.com, Joybuy, Temu.com, Walmart.com, and wish.com. Defendants engaged in federal copyright infringement (17 U.S.C. § 501(a)) (Count I) federal unfair competition (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)); (Count II); and common law unfair competition (Count III).

The remaining Defendants in this lawsuit have all defaulted and failed to cooperate in

discovery. The Defendants have been properly served pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 and are aware of this action, but nevertheless chose not to respond. The Clerk has entered default. The Plaintiff also served discovery upon Defendants, including Requests for Admission, and no response to the discovery was received.

By their default, Defendants have conceded the truth of the allegations of the Complaint. By their failure to respond to Requests for Admission, Defendants have admitted the matters therein. There are no issues of fact remaining in this suit, and a default judgment should be entered against Defendants providing for permanent injunctive relief, an award of damages under the Copyright Act in the amount of \$150,000.00 against each individual in Schedule A<sup>1</sup>, a post-judgment asset restraining order, and an order authorizing the release and transfer of Defendants' assets from the Third-Party Service Provider(s) and Financial Institution(s) to satisfy the damages, in whole or in part, awarded to Plaintiff. Courts in the Western District of Pennsylvania have previously entered a default judgment against each defendant in this amount or more using a similar method for proving and calculating damages that is used here. *See, e.g., Talsiman Designs LLC v. Ladyvana US*, No. 22-994 (W.D. Pa. October 20, 2022)(Schwab, J); *Doggie Dental, Inc. v. Ahui, et al.*, No. 19-cv-1627 (W.D. Pa., Sept. 27, 2021) (Hornak, CJ); *Osprey LLC v. Poolwhale, et al.*, No. 20-cv-1253 (W.D. Pa. December 3, 2020) (Hardy, J); *Doggie Dental, Inc. v. Anywill, et al.*, No. 19-cv-682 (W.D. Pa. August 14, 2020 (Hornak, CJ); and *Doggie Dental, Inc. v. Anywill, et al.*, No. 19-cv-746 (W.D. Pa. August 14, 2020 (Hornak, CJ).

---

<sup>1</sup> Without waiving its claims under federal unfair competition (Count II) and common law unfair competition (Count III), Plaintiff is electing to pursue statutory damages under the Copyright Act.

**A. This court has jurisdiction to enter default judgment against Defendants.**

This Court has jurisdiction to grant Plaintiff's motion and enter default judgment against Defendants because the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action as well as personal jurisdiction over the Defendants. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant the Lanham Act and the Copyright Act, , 15 U.S.C. § 1121, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over Plaintiff's state law claims because those claims are so related to the federal claims that they form part of the same case or controversy. *See Complaint*, ¶ 11 [ECF No. 2].

Personal jurisdiction may be established either by specific or general jurisdiction, but specific jurisdiction is appropriate in this case because of Defendants' contact with the forum. *See* 42 P. A. Cons. Stat. § 5322. The factors to consider when establishing specific jurisdiction are: "(1) the extent to which defendant 'purposefully avail[ed]' itself of the privilege of conducting activities in the State; (2) whether the Plaintiff's claims arise out of those activities directed at the State; and (3) whether the exercise of personal jurisdiction would be constitutionally 'reasonable.'" *See IMO Industries, Inc. v. Kiekert AG*, 155 F.3d 254, 259 (3rd Cir.1998). Defendants satisfy each of the factors to establish specific personal jurisdiction.

First, Defendants purposefully availed themselves of the privilege of conducting business in Pennsylvania and this Judicial District. Defendants purposefully targeted sales of infringing products to Pennsylvania residents, and did in fact sell infringing products into Pennsylvania. *See Complaint*, ¶ 11 [ECF No. 2]. These actions are sufficient to establish jurisdiction over Defendants. 42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 5322 (a). Second, Plaintiff's claims arise

directly from actions that occurred in this Judicial District. Plaintiff purchased infringing products to determine their authenticity and had the infringing products shipped to Pennsylvania. *See Declaration of Dee Odell* [ECF No. 12]. These unauthorized and unlicensed sales of infringing products in this Judicial district establish this Court's jurisdiction over Defendants.

Lastly, this Court's exercise of specific personal jurisdiction over Defendants is "reasonable" under the constitution. *World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson*, 444 U.S. 286, 292 (1980). The record in this case does not suggest that the burden of litigation in this District is extraordinary. Defendants offered to ship and sell their infringing products to any part of the United States. *See Complaint*, ¶ 13 [ECF No. 2]. Pennsylvania and this Court have a valid interest in the resolution of the grievances of its citizens and businesses, particularly when they potentially involve issues of [Pennsylvania] law. *See Square D Co. v. Scott Elec. Co.*, No. 06-459, 2008 WL 4462298, at \*12 (W.D. Pa. Sept. 30, 2008). Plaintiff has a valid and substantial interest in having their legal rights recognized and vindicated. *Id.* Therefore, this Court's exercise of specific personal jurisdiction over Defendants is constitutionally reasonable.

**B. Joinder of the Defendants is appropriate.**

Joinder of the defendants is proper when plaintiff seeks relief "jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to arising out of the same transaction, occurrence or series of transactions or occurrences;" and "any question of law or fact common to all defendants will arise in the action." Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(2). Joinder is consistent with the strongly encouraged policy of "entertaining the broadest possible scope of action consistent with fairness to the parties." *See United Mine Workers of Am. v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715. 724 (1966).

In a decision on joinder in an online counterfeiting case, the Northern District of Illinois found joinder was appropriate, stating:

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, “transaction” generally involves a “reciprocal effect” or “exchange,” whereas an “occurrence” is defined as something that simply “happens” or “appears.” Unlike a “transaction,” an “occurrence” is not necessarily the product of joint or coordinated action. The internet frequently produces occurrences that can be described as cooperative but not transactional or intentionally coordinated. Individual actions which alone may have minimal impact on society or the economy can have a substantial impact through aggregation that is only possible through the internet. Individuals on the internet can openly reach billions of people with a single click of a mouse, while at the same time hiding their identities, frustrating law enforcement. As a result, an “occurrence” of mass harm easily can be inflicted even if there is no express “transactional” coordination among the attackers.

Rule 20’s inclusion of the term “occurrence” should allow plaintiffs to join in a single case the defendants who participate in such unlawful occurrences, despite the lack of a “transactional link.” The kind of harmful occurrences the internet enables — including mass foreign counterfeiting — were inconceivable when Rule 20 was drafted. But the Rule’s inclusion of the term “occurrence” suggests that joinder is appropriate in cases alleging harm that is not strictly “transactional.” *Bose Corp. v. The Partnerships and Unincorporated Associations Identified on Schedule “A”*, No. 19-cv-7467 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 19, 2020) (Durkin, J.) at 10-11 [DE 46].

Moreover, in the present case there is something more -- the admitted allegations of the Complaint (*i.e.*, cooperating, communicating, coordinating with a common goal of creating one illegal competing marketplace). These additional activities further establish the necessary commonality to join the defendants into one action under either Rule 20. Thus, the well-pled factual allegations of Plaintiff’s Complaint properly allege the elements for joinder and the Defendants are properly joined in this case.

**B. Plaintiff is entitled to a default judgment against Defendants.**

**1. The Clerk properly entered default as to Defendants.**

The Clerk of this Court enters a default “[w]hen a party against whom judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a). The Clerk entered default

against Defendants because, as the docket reflects, the time for filing a responsive pleading expired.

**2. Factual allegations establish the defaulting Defendants' liability.**

**A. Liability for Copyright Infringement**

By failing to appear, contact Plaintiff, or otherwise defend against the Complaint, Defendants are deemed to have admitted every allegation therein, and the Court must only determine whether Plaintiff's Complaint properly states a claim for relief. *See Hritz v. Woma Corp.*, 732 F.2d 1178, 1180 (3d Cir. 1984); *see also Pair Networks, Inc. v. Lim Cheng Soon*, 2013 WL 452565, \*1 (W.D. Pa., February 6, 2013). Further, by failing to answer discovery, Defendants have each admitted:

**At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff owned the federally registered U.S. Copyright Registration Nos. VA-1-941-099 (SNOWMAN) and U.S. Copyright Registration No. VAu-1- 414-313 (SANTA) ("Plaintiff's Works")**

**Despite having the knowledge that you had no license or legal authority to do so, you engaged in the activity of promoting and otherwise advertising, selling, offering for sale, and/or distributing Infringing Products under your Seller ID or Seller IDs.**

**At all times relevant hereto, you have been engaged in the fraudulent promotion, advertisement, distribution, offering for sale, and/or sale of goods that are infringing copies of Plaintiff's Product.**

**You intentionally copied and/or infringed Plaintiff's intellectual property, in order to benefit from the Plaintiff's fame, reputation, and goodwill to divert Plaintiffs' profits into your business.**

**You intentionally make, use, offer to sell, or import into the United States counterfeit and substandard copies of Plaintiff's Product with English language packaging and instructions.**

(Declaration of Brian Samuel Malkin, ¶¶ 1 -5, filed herewith)

### **B. Liability for Unfair Competition**

To prevail on a claim of unfair competition under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, Plaintiff must prove that the Defaulting Defendants used in commerce, in connection with any goods or services, any word, term, name, symbol or device, or any combination thereof, or any false designation of origin, which is likely to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the Defaulting Defendants with Plaintiff, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval, of the Defaulting Defendants' goods by Plaintiff. 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1). In this case, the use of the copyrighted photos and other photos Plaintiff uses to designate and advertise its goods. As with trademark infringement claims, the test for liability for false designation of origin under Section 43(a) is also "whether the public is likely to be deceived or confused by the similarity of the marks at issue." *Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc.*, 505 U.S. 763, 780, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 2763 (1992).

Whether a defendant's use of plaintiff's trademarks created a likelihood of confusion between the plaintiff's and the defendant's products is also the determining factor in the analysis of unfair competition under the common law of Pennsylvania. *Mateson Chemical Corp. v. Vernon*, 2000 WL 680020, at \*5 n. 7 (E.D.Pa. May 9, 2000). Here, the Plaintiff has presented evidence that each of the Defendants displayed on their online stores one or more photographs of their infringing products, and thus unfairly competed under both federal law and Pennsylvania common law. See *Odell Dec.*<sup>2</sup> Moreover, through their failure to answer the discovery and the Complaint, the Defendants have each admitted to intentional unfair competition under federal

---

<sup>2</sup> Refers to *Declaration of Dee Odell* [ECF No. 13]

law (*Complaint*, ¶¶ 64 – 74) and common law (*Complaint*, ¶¶ 75 – 80). Having established liability, an award of damages against each of the Defendants is legally appropriate.

### **3. . Plaintiff is entitled to statutory damages under the Copyright Act.**

A plaintiff may pursue statutory damages of up to \$150,000.00 per infringement for willful copyright infringement. 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2). Defendants purposefully infringed Plaintiff's copyrighted images for profit. *See Complaint*, ¶¶ 56 - 63. By their failure to respond, Defendants have admitted their infringement is willful. *See Evony, LLC v. Holland*, No. 2:11-CV-00064, 2011 WL 1230405 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 31, 2011). *See also Tiffany (NJ) Inc. v. Luban*, 282 F. Supp. 2d 123, 124 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (infringement is deemed willful “[b]y virtue of the default”). Because Defendants willfully infringed Plaintiff's copyrighted images to sell knockoff goods, Plaintiff is entitled to statutory damages of \$150,000 per infringement of copyrighted image per defendant. In the *Evony* case, Judge McVerry awarded the maximum statutory copyright damages of \$300,000 (\$150,000 for each of the two works infringed) as a deterrent against the defaulting defendant for its willful infringement of the Plaintiff's copyrighted works. Likewise, Chief Judge Hornak has also awarded the maximum damages for each instance of copyright infringement committed by each defendant. *See Doggie Dental v. Anywill*, No. 19-cv-682 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020)(Hornak, CJ); *Doggie Dental v. Max\_Buy*, 19-746 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ); *Doggie Dental v. Go Well*, 19-1282(W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ); and *Doggie Dental v. Worthbuyer*, 19-1283 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ).

### **4. Plaintiff is Entitled to Permanent Injunctive Relief**

In addition to the foregoing relief, Plaintiff seeks entry of a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from infringing or otherwise violating Plaintiff's rights in its intellectual

property, including at least all injunctive relief previously awarded to by this Court to Plaintiff in the temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. *See Evony, LLC v. Holland*, No. 2:11-CV-00064, 2011 WL 1230405, at \*7 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 31, 2011) (“In this case, Plaintiffs have achieved “actual success on the merits” through the admission of liability arising from Defendant's default. Furthermore, the Verified Complaint establishes that Defendant unlawfully sells and distributes copyrighted and trademarked material of the Plaintiffs. Nothing in the facts before the Court indicates that Defendant has ceased this infringing activity; thus, a permanent injunction is warranted in this case on all claims of the Verified Complaint.”). Plaintiff is also entitled to injunctive relief so it can can prompt action against any new online marketplace accounts or websites that are identified, found to be linking to Defendants, and selling Infringing Product. A plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction under the Lanham Act, Copyright Act, and Pennsylvania common law. 15 U.S.C. § 1116; 17 U.S. Code § 502; and *B&B Microscopes v. Armogida*, 532 F. Supp. 2d 744, 760 (W.D. Pa. 2007) (citing *Brody's, Inc. v. Brody Bros., Inc.*, 454 A.2d 605, 607 (Pa. Super. Ct.1982)).

A permanent injunction, like the requested damages under the the Copyright Act, would help deter other individuals or corporations from infringing Plaintiff's valuable trademark and patent rights. Additionally, entry of a permanent injunction against Defendants in this case will help expedite any future litigations between the defaulting Defendants and Plaintiff, if a case between the parties arises in the future. This equitable result would be in the interest of justice and provide Plaintiff with more flexibility to protect its intellectual property rights. As such, permanent injunctions are routinely entered by other Courts in similar online counterfeiting cases. *See Nifty Home Products, Inc. v. Kafa Company, et al.*, No. 22-cv-1694 (W.D. Pa., September 12, 2023)(Colville , J.)[ECF No. 77]; *Talisman Designs, LLC v. Ahappyday*, No. 20-

cv-1915 (W.D. Pa, February 24, 2022)(Colville, J) [ECF No. No. 79]; *Talisman Designs v. Angelworld*, No. 21-cv-1292 (W.D. Pa., February 24, 2022)(Colville, J); *Doggie Dental v. Ahui*, 19-1627 (September 27, 2021)(Hornak, CJ); *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Belvia*, No. 20-cv-284 (W.D. Pa., April 21, 2020) (Schwab, J.); *Rapid Slicer LLC v. Art-House*, No. 19-411 (W.D. Pa., Jan. 9, 2020) (Horan, J.); and *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Abigail*, No. 19-cv-503 (W.D. Pa., Aug 13, 2019) (Fischer, J.); *Doggie Dental v. Anywill*, No. 19-cv-682 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020)(Hornak, CJ); *Doggie Dental v. Max\_Buy*, 19-746 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ); *Doggie Dental v. Go Well*, 19-1282(W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ); and *Doggie Dental v. Worthbuyer*, 19-1283 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ); *Airigian v. Bufugiujan, et al.*, 18-cv-1330-NBF and *Airigan v. Artifacts-Selling, et al*, 18-cv-1462-NBF, and *Airigan v. Babymove, et al.*, 19-cv-166-NBF.

**5. Plaintiff Requests That This Court Order the Transfer to It of Remaining Assets in Defaulting Defendants' Accounts**

Plaintiff requested a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, *inter alia*, to prevent Defendants from transferring the funds held in their Third Party Service Provider(s)<sup>3</sup> and Financial Institution(s)<sup>4</sup> accounts beyond this Court's jurisdiction.[ECF No. 4] This Court granted the temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, preventing Defendants from accessing the funds in their Third Party Service Provider(s) and Financial Institution(s) accounts. [ECF Nos. 22, 41] This Court found that Plaintiff had established a likelihood of success on the merits and irreparable harm in the absence of a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. *See Id.*

Plaintiff now requests that this Court order the Third Party Service Provider(s) and Financial Institution(s) to transfer to Plaintiff the assets currently held in the defaulting Defendants' Third Party Service Provider(s) and Financial Institution(s) accounts in partial payment of any award of damages. In the absence of such an Order, it is likely that Plaintiff will be left without any effective means by which to collect from Defendants any monetary judgment entered by this Court. As explained, previously, Defendants and any assets they won, other than those held in their respective Third Party Service Provider(s) and Financial Institution(s) accounts, are presumably located in

---

<sup>3</sup> Refers to Amazon Services, LLC d/b/a Amazon.com, and Amazon Payments, Inc. d/b/a Amazon Pay (collectively "Amazon"), Joybuy Marketplace operated by Jingdong E-Commerce (Trade) Hong Kong Co. , Ltd and JD E-Commerce America (collectively, "Joybuy"), Whaleco Inc., a Delaware Corporation, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Pinduoduo Inc. which is owned by PDD Holdings (collectively, "Temu"), eBay, Inc. d/b/a ebay.com, Walmart Inc. and Wal-Mart.com USA, LLC, wish.com, Alibaba.com US LLC d/b/a Alibaba.com and Aliexpress.com.

<sup>4</sup> Refers to financial institutions, including but not limited to, Zhejiang Ant Small and Micro Financial Services Group Co., Ltd. AliPay (China) Internet Technology Co. Ltd., and Alipay.com Co., Ltd. (collectively referred to as "AliPay")<sup>4</sup>, Amazon Payments, Inc., Walmart Pay, PayPal, Inc. d/b/a paypal.com, and Context Logic, Inc. d/b/a wish.com ("Financial Institutions").

China. There is no bilateral treaty or multilateral convention in force between the United States and any other country on reciprocal recognition and enforcement of judgments. Moreover, as explained in some detail previously, Defendants are involved in illegal counterfeiting operations and go to great lengths to conceal their identities and whereabouts. As a result, even in the unlikely event that Plaintiff could enforce a U.S. judgment in the Chinese courts, it will be virtually impossible to locate Defendants or any assets they may hold in order to satisfy any monetary damages awarded in this case.

Such orders are routinely entered by our Courts to satisfy monetary judgment awards in similar counterfeiting cases. *See Nifty Home Products, Inc. v. Kafa Company, et al.*, No. 22-cv-1694 (W.D. Pa., September 12, 2023)(Colville, J.)[ECF No. 77}; *Talisman Designs, LLC v. Ahappyday*, No. 20-cv-1915 (W.D. Pa, February 24, 2022)(Colville, J) [ECF No. No. 79]; *Talisman Designs v. Angelworld*, No. 21-cv-1292 (W.D. Pa., February 24, 2022)(Colville, J); *Doggie Dental v. Ahui*, 19-1627 (September 27, 2021)(Hornak, CJ); *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Belvia*, No. 20-cv-284 (W.D. Pa., April 21, 2020) (Schwab, J.); *Rapid Slicer LLC v. Art-House*, No. 19-411 (W.D. Pa., Jan. 9, 2020) (Horan, J.); and *Airigan Solutions, LLC v. Abigail*, No. 19-cv-503 (W.D. Pa., Aug 13, 2019) (Fischer, J.); *Doggie Dental v. Anywill*, No. 19-cv-682 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020)(Hornak, CJ); *Doggie Dental v. Max\_Buy*, 19-746 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ); *Doggie Dental v. Go Well*, 19-1282(W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ); and *Doggie Dental v. Worthbuyer*, 19-1283 (W.D. Pa., August 14, 2020) (Hornak, CJ).

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant its Motion for Default Judgment; enter judgment against Defendants for (Count I) copyright infringement; (Count II) federal unfair competition; and (Count III) common law unfair competition;

permanently enjoin Defendants and award Plaintiff statutory damages for copyright infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c) against all the defendants; award Plaintiff pre-judgment interest and post-judgment interest on the above damages awards; and grant such further relief as this Court deems appropriate. Plaintiff additionally requests that this Court order the Third Party Service Provider(s) and Financial Institution(s) to transfer Defendants' assets held by the Third Party Service Provider(s) and Financial Institution(s) to Plaintiff in partial payment of any default judgment entered against Defendants.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 4, 2024

/s/ Stanley D. Ference III

Stanley D. Ference III

Pa. ID No. 59899

courts@ferencelaw.com

Brian Samuel Malkin

Pa. ID No. 70448

bmalkin@ferencelaw.com

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES LLC

409 Broad Street

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143

(412) 741-8400 - Telephone

(412) 741-9292 – Facsimile

Attorneys for Plaintiff