

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

ABRAHAM SZOMOR,

Plaintiff,

v.

WANGDEPENGBM2, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-01406

(Judge W. Scott Hardy)

**DECLARATION OF STANLEY D. FERENGE III IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO THE MOVING DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO DISMISS FOR MISJOINDER [42]**

I, STANLEY D. FERENGE III, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney with the law firm of Ference & Associates LLC (“the Ference Firm”), located at 409 Broad Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143, and represent Del Parson (“Plaintiff”) in the above-referenced action. I make and submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff’s Response in Opposition to the Moving Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for Misjoinder [ECF No. 42]. The facts stated below are based on my personal knowledge and, if called upon to do so, I could and would competently testify to the following facts set forth below.

2. Exhibit 2 to Plaintiff’s Opposition to the Moving Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss for Misjoinder features 12 company summary charts. These charts consist of: (a) one company summary chart prepared for the present action (pages 2-10); (b) one company/subsidiary summary chart for Fu Zhou Hai Yi Tong E-commerce Co., Ltd. (“Fu Zhou”) (pages 11-20), which was previously identified as a parent company to several of the companies identified by the Moving Defendants; and (c) ten additional summary charts compiled from other infringement actions (pages 21-66), including six within this District, involving the same or related defendants represented by Attorney Jiyuan Zhang that likewise filed identical or similar motions to dismiss

for misjoinder and were discovered to have ties to the same Fu Zhou parent company. The yellow-highlighted rows denote those defendants that were revealed to have a direct connection to the Fu Zhou company, while the light red-highlighted rows denote defendants that, while not having a direct connection to Fu Zhou, nonetheless were identified litigating together with defendants that had direct connections to the Fu Zhou parent company.

3. The company/subsidiary summary chart for Fu Zhou (Exhibit 2, pages 11-20) was first compiled by listing in the left column all the company names identified by defendants either through their own Temu storefronts or through the local rule corporate disclosures filed in *Susan Florence Comish v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-07049 (N.D. Ill.); *Susan Florence Comish v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-07393 (N.D. Ill.); *Alison Friend v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-04313 (N.D. Ill.); *Angela Isabel Porter v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-08071 (N.D. Ill.); *Elaine Kay Maier v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-07534 (N.D. Ill. 2025); *Susan Florence Comish v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-06997 (N.D. Ill.); and *Greg Alexander v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-07026 (N.D. Ill.). The related defendant Temu stores, which were identified with the entities disclosed, were then documented in the middle column. In each of these cases, and before the filings identifying the subsidiary companies tied to each defendant Temu store, declarations from Fu Zhou corporate representatives, primarily “Yixun Yang,” the CFO and director of Fu Zhou, and “San Zhang,” the general manager of Fu Zhou, were filed. In those declarations, “Yixun Yang” or “San Zhang” stated that the Fu Zhou company owns and operates the Temu stores identified in the middle column, among many other stores.¹ The corporate representatives for Fu Zhou and the related subsidiary companies are identified in the right column, along with the ECF docket number where the declaration was filed.

¹ Fu Zhou operates additional Temu stores that were not mentioned in the company/subsidiary chart for Fu Zhou because no additional legal entity was disclosed for those Temu stores at the time of those filings.

4. The four company summary charts (Exhibit 2, pages 48-66) for *Angela Isabel Porter v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-08071 (N.D. Ill.); *Elaine Kay Maier v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-07534 (N.D. Ill. 2025); *Greg Alexander v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-07026 (N.D. Ill.), and *Susan Florence Comish v. The P'ships et al.*, No. 25-cv-06997 (N.D. Ill.), were likewise compiled by first listing in the left column all the company names identified by defendants either through their own Temu storefronts or through the local rule corporate disclosures filed in those cases. The related defendant Temu stores, which were identified with the entities disclosed, were then documented in the middle column. In those cases, the defendants filed additional declarations identifying a corporate representative for each corporate entity disclosed. The corporate representatives identified were documented in the right column. The defendant Temu stores that did not identify a legal entity but, instead, identified a sole, individual owner of the Temu store, were noted in the "Alleged Sole Proprietors" section under the company summary charts for each case. Certain rows in the company summary charts for these cases were then highlighted in yellow after cross-checking the company/subsidiary chart for Fu Zhou for the same company name disclosed and/or Temu store identified (with matching Temu Merchant ID). If there was a match, the row was highlighted yellow. The particular connections identified are explained through footnote numbers 159 through 182, which contain citations to the relevant case, declaration, and/or corporate disclosure where the defendant information was previously identified.

5. Seven of the company summary charts for *Del Parson v. Sixinone, et al.*, 2:25-cv-01436-CCW (W.D. Pa.), *Cynthia Jo Jacobs v. Xuxhenqian, et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-01403-WSS (W.D. Pa.); *Abraham Szomor v. Wangdepengbm2, et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-01406-WSH, Dkts. 42, 42-2 (W.D. Pa.); *Lisa Audit v. Herbert Decor, et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-01433-WSS (W.D. Pa.); *Lisa Audit*

v. HH Temus, et al., No. 2:25-cv-01487-WSS (W.D. Pa.); *Lisa Audit v. The Individuals, et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-01553-WSS (W.D. Pa.); and *Abraham Szomor v. Schedule A Defendants et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-01696-WSH (W.D. Pa.) (Exhibit 2, pages 2-10, and 21-47) were compiled by first listing the corporate entities identified by the moving defendants in their Local Rule 7.1 disclosures on the left column, with the corresponding defendant Temu stores when being identified in the middle column. The defendant Temu stores that did not identify a legal entity but, instead, identified a sole, individual owner of the Temu store, were noted in the “Alleged Sole Proprietors” section under the company summary charts for each case. For both the company summary charts and the “Alleged Sole Proprietor” sections created for each case, certain rows were then highlighted in yellow after cross-checking the company/subsidiary chart for Fu Zhou for the same company name disclosed or Temu store identified (with matching Temu Merchant ID). If there was a match, the row was highlighted in yellow. Certain rows were also highlighted in light red if the Temu store, while not having been previously identified as directly owned or affiliated with the Fu Zhou company, nonetheless had previously appeared and litigated with a group of defendants that had direct ties to the Fu Zhou company. The cross-check also revealed previously identified corporate representatives for the same Temu stores, which were then added to the right column of the company summary charts for each case. The particular connections identified are explained through the footnote numbers 1 through 33, and 62 through 157, which contain citations to the relevant case, declaration, and/or corporate disclosure where the defendant information was previously identified.

6. For all rows highlighted in yellow in the company charts for the Western District of Pennsylvania cases, a footnote was added to the company/subsidiary summary chart for Fu

Zhou to identify the connection and the new company name each Temu store was using in these cases. *See* Footnotes 34 through 61.

7. All non-highlighted rows denote defendants that have not previously been identified with defendants tied to or litigating together with the Fu Zhou company. Nonetheless, it is believed that these non-highlighted defendant Temu stores are still owned or affiliated with the same Fu Zhou or other shared parent company based on the identical nature of the infringement and Fu Zhou’s admission that it “establish[es] separate entities for different stores...primarily [for] tax considerations in China,” summarizing that, therefore, “for tax efficiency, [it] generally establish[es] a separate legal entity for each store.” *See Susan Florence Comish v. The Partnerships et al.*, No. 25-cv-07049, Dkt. 47-1 at ¶ 7 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 16, 2025).

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
January 23, 2026

/s/ Stanley D. Ference III
Stanley D. Ference