(Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1	Filed 07/14/10 Page 1 of 20 Page ID #:5
1	Brent H. Blakely (SBN 157292) bblakely@blakelylawgroup.com	EN ED
23	Cindy Chan (SBN 247495) cchan@blakelylawgroup.com BLAKELY LAW GROUP	
5 4	915 North Citrus Avenue	10 JUL 14 PH 2:43
5	Los Angeles, California 90038 Telephone: (323) 464-7400	CLERNS SUBJECT COURT CENTRAS DE VECALIF. 190 ARGELES
6	Facsimile: (323) 464-7410 Attorneys for Plaintiffs	3Y:
7	Coach Inc., and Coach Services, Inc.	
8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
9	SOUTHERN DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA
10		NUM FILO
11	COACH, INC., a Maryland Corporation; COACH SERVICES, INC., a Maryland	2 CASE NO. 6V 10 5160-64
12	Corporation,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:
13	Plaintiffs,) 1. TRADEMARK) COUNTERFEITING;
14	V.) 2. FEDERAL TRADEMARK
15	LAFIDALE, INC., a California Corporation dba ELLE LAFIDALE;) INFRINGEMENT;
16 17	JOHN LEE, an individual; AMILCÁR GONAN; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,) 3. FALSE DESIGNATIONS OF) ORIGIN AND FALSE) ADVERTISING;
18	Defendants.) 4. FEDERAL TRADEMARK
19) DILUTION ;
20) 5. TRADEMARK DILUTION) UNDER CALIFORNIA LAW;
21) 6. COMMON LAW UNFAIR
22		COMPETITION;
23) JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
24	Plaintiffs Coach, Inc., and Coach Serv	vices, Inc. ("Plaintiffs") for their claims
25	against Defendants Lafidale, Inc. dba Elle L	afidale, John Lee, and Amilcar Gonan
26	(collectively "Defendants") respectfully alle	ge as follows:
27	///	
28	///	

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. Plaintiffs file this action against Defendants for trademark infringement and trademark dilution under the Lanham Trademark Act of 1946, 15 U.S.C. §1051 et seq. (the "Lanham Act"), and related claims of unfair competition and trademark dilution under the statutory and common law of the State of California. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the Federal trademark counterfeiting and infringement and trademark dilution claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A §§1121(a), 1331, 1338(a).

2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the remaining claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A § 1367, since those claims are related to and arise from the same set of facts as Plaintiffs' trademark infringement claims.

3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants do business within this judicial district, and the acts complained of occurred in this judicial district.

4. This action arises out of wrongful acts by Defendants within this judicial district. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because the claims asserted arise in this district.

THE PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Coach, Inc. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland, with its principal place of business in New York, New York. Plaintiff Coach Services, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of Coach, Inc., is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland with its principal place of business in Jacksonville, Florida. Plaintiffs Coach, Inc. and Coach Services, Inc. will hereinafter be collectively referred to as "Coach."

6. Upon information and belief, Defendant Lafidale, Inc. dba "Elle Lafidale" (hereinafter "Lafidale") is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the state of California with an office and principal place of business at 117 East Eleventh Street, Los Angeles, California 90015.

ase 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 3 of 20 Page ID #:7

7. Upon information and belief, Defendant John Lee is an individual domiciled in this judicial district and/or doing business at Lafidale.

8. Upon information and belief, Defendant Amilcar Gonan is an individual domiciled in this judicial district and/or doing business at Lafidale.

9. Plaintiffs are unaware of the names and true capacities of Defendants, whether individual, corporate and/or partnership entities, named herein as DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sue them by their fictitious names. Plaintiffs will seek leave to amend this complaint when their true names and capacities are ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that said Defendants and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, are in some manner responsible for the wrongs alleged herein, and that at all times referenced each was the agent and servant of the other Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and employment.

10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that at all relevant times herein, Defendants and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, knew or reasonably should have known of the acts and behavior alleged herein and the damages caused thereby, and by their inaction ratified and encouraged such acts and behavior. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, had a non-delegable duty to prevent or cause such acts and the behavior described herein, which duty Defendants and DOES 1 though 10, inclusive, failed and/or refused to perform.

A.

I

2

3

4

5

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION The Coach Brand and its Family of Marks

11. Coach was founded more than sixty years ago as a family-run workshop
in Manhattan. Since then Coach has been engaged in the manufacture, marketing and
sale of fine leather and mixed material products including handbags, wallets,
accessories, eyewear, footwear, jewelry and watches. Coach sells its goods through its
own specialty retail stores, department stores, catalogs and via an Internet website
www.coach.com throughout the United States.

12. Coach is the worldwide owner of the trademark "COACH" and various composite trademarks and assorted design components (collectively "Coach Marks"). Coach Marks include but are not limited to the following marks:

Mark	U.S. Registration No(s).	Registration Date
"COACH"	751, 493	06/25/1963
	1,071,000	08/09/1977
	2,088,706	08/19/1997
	3,157,972	10/17/2006
Coach est. 1941	3,413,536	04/15/2008
OU U H est john U H est john OU U H est john O	3,251,315	06/12/2007
EST. 1941	3,441,671	06/03/2008
COACH	2,252,847	06/15/1999
COACH	2,534,429	01/29/2002
COACH	1,309,779	12/18/1984
	2,045,676	03/18/1997
	2,169,808	06/30/1998
	2,592,963	07/09/2002
ČŎ	2,626,565	09/24/2002
Signature "C" Mark	2,822,318	03/16/2004
	2,832,589	04/13/2004
	2,822,629	03/16/2004
	3,695,290	10/13/2009

Ca	se 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW	Document 1 F	Filed 07/14/10	Page 5 of 20	Page ID #:
I	CO	3,696,470		10/13/2009	
2 3	ČÜ				
4	"Op Art" Mark				
5		3,012,585		11/08/2005	
6					
7					
9	COX63	3,338,048		11/11/2007	
10					
11					
12 13		2 1 (2 202		06/02/1008	
14	Eaven	2,162,303		06/02/1998	
15	Colo Constantino				
16					
17 18	A Contraction of the contraction	2,088,707		08/19/1997	
19	Cooperation of the second seco				
20					
21	13. Coach has long b	peen manufactur	ring and selling	g in interstate	commerce

high quality leather and mixed material products under the Coach Marks. These registrations are valid and subsisting and are incontestable. Through longstanding use, advertising, and registration, the Coach Marks have achieved a high degree of consumer recognition and constitute famous marks.

23

24

25

26

27

Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 6 of 20 Page ID #:10

1 14. Coach and its predecessors have continuously used the Coach Marks in
 2 interstate commerce in connection with the sale, distribution, promotion, and
 3 advertising of its goods for four decades.

15. Plaintiff's Coach Marks are highly recognized by the public and serve to identify the source of the goods as Coach.

16. Coach has achieved sales volumes of over three billion dollars annually and has spent over a hundred million dollars in advertising, promoting, and marketing goods bearing the Coach Marks. As such, the Coach Marks and the goodwill associated therewith are valuable assets of Coach.

17. Due to Coach and its predecessors' long use, extensive sales, and significant advertising and promotional activities, the Coach Marks have achieved widespread acceptance and recognition among the consuming public and trade throughout the United States. The arbitrary and distinctive Coach Marks identify Coach as the source/origin of the goods on which it appears.

B. Defendants' Infringing Conduct

18. On or around March 2010, Plaintiff discovered that Defendant Lafidale,
Inc. dba Elle Lafidale, located at 117 East Eleventh Street in the city of Los Angeles,
California, had been offering for sale, and/or selling goods bearing counterfeit
reproductions of the Coach Marks, specifically infringements of Coach's Signature
"C" Mark and Op Art Mark (see above).

19. Coach representatives have inspected samples of the merchandiseobtained from Lafidale and have determined said merchandise to be counterfeit.

20. Upon information and belief, the individual Defendants named herein were the active, moving, and conscious forces behind the alleged infringing activities of Lafidale.

6 21. None of the above-named Defendants are authorized by Coach to
7 manufacture, distribute, advertise, offer for sale, and/or sell merchandise bearing any
8 of the Coach Marks.

1

2

9

10

11

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Trademark Counterfeiting – 15 U.S.C. § 1114)

3 22. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the averments of the preceding 4 paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

5 23. Defendants, without authorization from Coach, have used and are continuing to use spurious designations that are identical to, or substantially 6 7 indistinguishable from, the Coach Marks in interstate commerce.

8 24. The foregoing acts of Defendants are intended to cause, have caused, and are likely to continue to cause confusion or mistake, or to deceive consumers, the public, and the trade into believing that Defendants' counterfeit products are genuine or authorized products of Coach.

12 25. Upon information and belief, Defendants have acted with knowledge of 13 Coach's ownership of the Coach Marks and with deliberate intention or willful 14 blindness to unfairly benefit from the incalculable goodwill inherent in the Coach 15 Marks.

16 26. Defendants' acts constitute trademark counterfeiting in violation of Section 32 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1114). 17

Upon information and belief, Defendants have made and will continue 18 27. 19 to make substantial profits and gains to which they are not in law or equity entitled.

20 28. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to continue their 21 infringing acts, unless restrained by this Court.

22 29. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Plaintiffs, 23 and Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

24 In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief 30. 25 prohibiting Defendants from using the Coach Marks or any marks identical and/or confusingly similar thereto for any purpose, and to recover from Defendants all 26 27 damages, including attorneys' fees, that Plaintiffs have sustained and will sustain as a result of such infringing acts, and all gains, profits and advantages obtained by 28

Defendants as a result thereof, in an amount not yet known, as well as the costs of this 2 action pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), attorneys' fees and treble damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(b), and/or statutory damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C § 1117(c).

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Federal Trademark Infringement – 15 U.S.C. 1114)

31. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the averments of the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

32. The Coach Marks are nationally recognized, including within the Southern District of California, as being affixed to goods and merchandise of the highest quality and coming from Plaintiffs.

33. The registrations embodying the Coach Marks are in full force and effect and Plaintiffs have authorized responsible manufacturers and vendors to sell merchandise with these marks.

34. Defendants' unauthorized use of the Coach Marks on inferior quality merchandise in interstate commerce and advertising relating to same constitutes false designation of origin and a false representation that the goods and services are manufactured, offered, sponsored, authorized, licensed by or otherwise connected with Plaintiffs or come from the same source as Plaintiffs' goods and are of the same quality as that assured by the Coach Marks.

Defendants' use of The Coach Marks is without Plaintiffs' permission or 35. authority and is in total disregard of Plaintiffs' rights to control their trademarks.

36. Defendants' activities are likely to lead to and result in confusion, mistake or deception and are likely to cause the public to believe that Plaintiffs have produced, sponsored, authorized, licensed or are otherwise connected or affiliated with Defendants' commercial and business activities, all to the detriment of Plaintiffs.

37. Upon information and belief, Defendants' acts are deliberate and intended to confuse the public as to the source of Defendants' goods or services and to

1

injure Plaintiffs and reap the benefit of Plaintiffs' goodwill associated with Plaintiffs'
 trademarks.

38. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' willful and unlawful conduct, Plaintiffs have been injured and will continue to suffer injury to their businesses and reputations unless Defendants are restrained by this Court from infringing Plaintiffs' trademarks.

39. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

40. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from using The Coach Marks or any marks identical and/or confusingly similar thereto for any purpose, and to recover from Defendants all damages, including attorneys' fees, that Plaintiffs have sustained and will sustain as a result of such infringing acts, and all gains, profits and advantages obtained by Defendants as a result thereof, in an amount not yet known, as well as the costs of this action pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), attorneys' fees and treble damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(b), and/or statutory damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C § 1117(c).

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(False Designation of Origin and False Advertising - 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))

41. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the averments of the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

42. The Coach Marks are nonfunctional and their inherently distinctive quality has achieved a high degree of consumer recognition and serves to identify Plaintiffs as the source of high-quality goods.

43. Defendants' promotion, advertising, distribution, sale, and/or offering for sale of counterfeit Coach products, together with Defendants' use of other indicia associated with Coach is intended, and is likely to confuse, mislead, or deceive consumers, the public, and the trade as to the origin, source, sponsorship, or affiliation of said products, and is intended, and is likely to cause such parties to believe in error that the Defendants' counterfeit products have been authorized, sponsored, approved,
 endorsed or licensed by Coach, or that Defendants are in some way affiliated with
 Coach

44. Defendants' use of the Coach Marks is without Plaintiffs' permission or authority and is in total disregard of Plaintiffs' rights to control their trademarks.

45. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

46. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from using The Coach Marks, or any marks confusingly similar thereto, and to recover all damages, including attorneys' fees, that Plaintiffs have sustained and will sustain, and all gains, profits and advantages obtained by Defendants as a result of their infringing acts alleged above in an amount not yet known, as well as the costs of this action.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Federal Trademark Dilution – 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c))

47. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the averments of the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

48. The Coach Marks are strong and distinctive marks that have been in use for many years and have achieved enormous and widespread public recognition, and are thus "famous" within the meaning of the Lanham Act.

49. Defendants have used in commerce in connection with the sale of their products counterfeit reproductions of the Coach Marks, which is likely to cause, and most likely has caused, confusion or mistake as to the affiliation, connection, or association between Defendants and Plaintiffs, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of said counterfeit goods by Plaintiffs.

50. Defendants' acts described above have diluted and continue to dilute the unique and distinctive Coach Marks. These acts violate the Lanham Act, have injured and, unless immediately restrained, will continue to injure Plaintiffs, causing damage Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 11 of 20 Page ID #:15

to Plaintiffs in an amount to be determined at trial, as well as irreparable injury to the 1 goodwill and reputation associated with the Coach Marks.

51. Upon information and belief, Defendants' unlawful actions began long after the Coach Marks became famous.

52. Upon information and belief, Defendants acted knowingly, deliberately and willfully with the intent to trade on the reputation of the Coach® brand, and to dilute the Coach Marks. Defendants' conduct is willful, wanton, and egregious.

53. Upon information and belief, the individual Defendants herein named were active, moving, conscious forces behind the alleged infringing activities.

Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to compensate them fully for 54. the damages that have been caused and which will continue to be caused by Defendants' unlawful acts unless they are enjoined by this Court.

55. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from using the Coach Marks, and to recover all damages, including attorneys' fees, that Plaintiffs have sustained and will sustain, and all gains, profits and advantages obtained by Defendants as a result of their infringing acts alleged above in an amount not yet known, as well as the costs of this action.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Trademark Dilution in Violation of Cal. & Bus. Prof. Code)

56. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the averments of the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

The Coach Marks are distinctive in the State of California by virtue of 57. their substantial inherent and acquired distinctiveness, extensive use in the State of California, and the extensive advertising and wide spread publicity of the marks in the State of California.

As a result of the substantial inherent and acquired distinctiveness of the 58. Coach Marks, their extensive use in the State of California, and the extensive

Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 12 of 20 Page ID #:16

advertising and publicity of said marks in the State of California, the Coach Marks
 have become strong and are widely renowned.

59. The actions of Defendants complained of herein are likely to injure the
business reputations and dilute the distinctive quality of the Coach Marks, which are
famous.

60. The foregoing acts of Defendants constitute dilution and injury to business reputations in violation of the California Business and Professions Code.

61. The conduct herein complained of was extreme, outrageous, fraudulent, and was inflicted on Plaintiffs in reckless disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. Said conduct was despicable and harmful to Plaintiffs and as such supports an award of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and make an example of the Defendants and to deter them from similar such conduct in the future.

62. Upon information and belief, the individual Defendants herein named were active, moving, conscious forces behind the alleged infringing activities.

63. By reason of the foregoing, Plaintiffs are being damaged by Defendants' unauthorized and illegal use of the Coach Marks in the manner set forth above, and will continue to be damaged unless Defendants are immediately enjoined under Section 14247 of the California Business and Professions Code from using any of the Coach Marks.

64. Plaintiffs will be irreparably injured by the continued acts of Defendants, unless such acts are enjoined.

65. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Plaintiffs, and Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

66. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from using the Coach Marks for any purpose, destruction of the counterfeit merchandise, and recovery of up to three times their profits from, and up to three times all damages suffered by reason of, Defendants' wrongful manufacture, use, display, or sale of infringing products.

Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 13 of 20 Page ID #:17 1 SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF 2 (Common Law Unfair Competition) 3 67. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by reference the averments of the preceding 4 paragraphs as though fully set forth herein. 5 68. Plaintiffs own and enjoy common law trademark rights to the Coach Marks in California and throughout the United States. 6 Defendants' unlawful acts in appropriating rights in the Coach Marks 7 69. 8 were intended to capitalize on Plaintiffs' goodwill associated therewith for 9 Defendants' own pecuniary gain. Plaintiffs have expended substantial time, resources and effort to obtain an excellent reputation for their respective brands. As a result of 10 11 Plaintiffs' efforts, Defendants are now unjustly enriched and are benefiting from 12 property rights that rightfully belong to Plaintiffs. 13 70. Defendants' unauthorized use of the Coach Marks has caused and is likely to cause confusion as to the source of Defendants' products, all to the detriment 14 15 of Plaintiffs. 71. Defendants' acts are willful, deliberate, and intended to confuse the 16 17 public and to injure Plaintiffs. 18 72. Defendants' acts constitute unfair competition under California common 19 law. 20 73. Plaintiffs have been irreparably harmed and will continue to be 21 irreparably harmed as a result of Defendants' unlawful acts unless Defendants are 22 permanently enjoined from their unlawful conduct. 23 74. The conduct herein complained of was extreme, outrageous, fraudulent, and was inflicted on Plaintiffs in reckless disregard of Plaintiffs' rights. Said conduct 24 25 was despicable and harmful to Plaintiffs, and as such supports an award of exemplary 26 and punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and make an example of the Defendants and to deter them from similar such conduct in the future. 27 28 13 **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 14 of 20 Page ID #:18

75. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Plaintiffs,
 and Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

76. In light of the foregoing, Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from using the Coach Marks, and to recover all damages, including attorneys' fees, that Plaintiffs have sustained and will sustain and all gains, profits and advantages obtained by Defendants as a result of their infringing acts alleged above in an amount not yet known, as well as the costs of this action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for judgment against Defendants, as follows:

Granting temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief
 restraining and enjoining Defendants, their officers, agents, employees, and attorneys,
 and all those persons or entities in active concert or participation with them from:

(a) manufacturing, importing, advertising, marketing, promoting,
 supplying, distributing, offering for sale, or selling any products which bear the Coach
 Marks, or any other mark confusingly similar thereto;

(b) engaging in any other activity constituting unfair competition with Coach, or acts and practices that deceive consumers, the public, and/or trade, including without limitation, the use of designations and design elements associated with Coach;

(c) engaging in any other activity that will dilute the distinctiveness of the Coach Marks;

(d) committing any other act which falsely represents or which has the
 effect of falsely representing that the goods and services of Defendants are licensed by,
 authorized by, offered by, produced by, sponsored by, or in any other way associated
 with Plaintiffs;

2. Ordering Defendants to recall from any distributors and retailers and to deliver to Coach for destruction or other disposition all remaining inventory of all

Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 15 of 20 Page ID #:19

infringing products, including all advertisements, promotional and marketing materials
 therefore, as well as means of making same;

3. Ordering Defendants to file with this Court and serve on Coach within thirty (30) days after entry of the injunction a report in writing, under oath setting forth in detail the manner and form in which Defendants have complied with the injunction;

4. Ordering an accounting by Defendants of all gains, profits and advantages derived from their wrongful acts;

5. Awarding Plaintiffs all of Defendants' profits and all damages sustained
by Plaintiff as a result of Defendants' wrongful acts, and such other compensatory
damages as the Court determines to be fair and appropriate pursuant to 15 U.S.C.
§ 1117(a);

6. Awarding treble damages in the amount of Defendants' profits or
Plaintiffs' damages, whichever is greater, for willful infringement pursuant to 15
U.S.C. § 1117(b);

7. Awarding applicable interest, costs, disbursements and attorneys' fees, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(b);

Awarding Plaintiffs' statutory damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1117(c);
 Such other relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: July 13, 2010

BLAKELY LAW GROUP

By: <u>My</u> Brent H. Blakely Cindy Chan *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Coach, Inc. and Coach Services, Inc.*

Ca	se 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW	Document 1	Filed 07/14/10	Page 16 of 20	Page ID #:20	
1		DEMAND F	OR JURY TRL	AL		
2	Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs hereby					
3	demand a trial by jury as to all claims in this litigation.					
4						
5	Dated: July 13, 2010	E	BLAKELY LAW	V GROUP		
6			$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{k}$			
7		E	By: Mind			
8			Brent H. B Cindy Cha	lakely n		
9			Coach, Ind	n for Plaintiffs c. and Coach Se	rvices, Inc.	
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20 21						
$\begin{array}{c c} 21 \\ 22 \end{array}$						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge George King and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Carla Woehrle.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV10- 5160 GHK (CWx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed. a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

[X] Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

L Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Docume Brent H. Blakely (SBN 157292) Cindy Chan (SBN 247495) BLAKELY LAW GROUP 915 North Citrus Avenue Hollywood, California 90038 Attorneys for Plaintiffs	nt 1 Filed 07/14/10	Page 18 of 20	Page ID #:22			
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
COACH, INC., a Maryland Corporation; COACH SERVICES, INC., a Maryland Corporation,	CASE NUMBER					
PLAINTIFF(S) V.	CV 10	5160-6	HARLOWS			
LAFIDALE, INC., a California Corporation dba ELLE LAFIDALE; JOHN LEE, an individual; AMILCAR GONAN, and DOES 1-10, inclusive, DEFENDANT(S).	SUN	IMONS				

TO: DEFENDANT(S): LAFIDALE, INC. dba ELLE LAFIDALE; JOHN LEE; AMILCAR GONAN

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it), you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached Δ complaint \Box amended complaint \Box counterclaim \Box cross-claim or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff"s attorney, <u>Brent H. Blakely and/or Cindy Chan</u>, whose address is 915 North Citrus Avenue, Hollywood, California 90038 _______. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

		Clerk, U.S. District Court
Dated:	<u>a 4 jul 2010</u>	By: MARILYHIDAWS
		(Seal of the Court)

[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed oU days by Rule 12(a)(3)].

Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 19 of 20 Page ID #:23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

				Т					
I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself []) Coach. Inc. and Coach Services, Inc.				DANTS le, Inc. dba Elle La	fidale; Johr	i Lee; Amilear (Jonan		
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, A yourself, provide same,)	ddress and Telephone Number	If you are repres	enting Attorneys	(If Known)		<u></u>			
BLAKELY LAW GROU 915 North Citrus Avenue Hollywood, California 90		/400							
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTIO	ON (Place an X in one box only.)		CITIZENSHIP OF I Place an X in one bo				s Only		
U I U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S Government Not a Par		r. of This State	PT 1		ncorporated or I of Business in th		PTF [] 4	DEF [] 4
112 U.S. Government Defendar	nt U.4 Diversity (Indicate Cit of Parties in Item III)	izenship Citize	n of Another State	□ 2		ncorporated and of Business in A	Principal Place nother State	□ 5	LI 5
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or		Citize	n or Subject of a For	eign Country 🗇 3	E 3 F	oreign Nation		□ 6	$\square 6$
V. REQUESTED IN COMPL		Reopeneo				Distr	ict Judg	sil to D e from strate 2	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cit 15 U.S.C 1114 and 15 U.S. VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Plac OTHER STATUTES	S.C. 1125 - Trademark Infringen		im Act	atement of cause.		jurisdictional sta	atutes unless dive		
 □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. □ 1460 Deportation □ 1470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 1490 Cable/Sat TV □ 1810 Sefective Service 	 □ Insurance □ I20 Marine □ I30 Miller Act □ I40 Negotiable Instrument □ I50 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ I51 Medicare Act □ I52 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. 	PERSONA 310 Airpla Liabil 320 Assau Slande 330 Fed. E Liabil 340 Marim 345 Marim Liabili 350 Motor	L INJURY me me Product [] 370 ity [] 371 It, Libel & [] 380 mployers' ity e B4 e Product [] 422	PERSONAL PROPERTY Other Fraud Truth in Lending Other Personal Property Damage Property Damage Product Liability ANKRUPTCY	PE" 510 M V(14 530 G 535 Da 540 M 0t 550 Ci 555 Pr	TITIONS otions to icate Sentence ibeas Corpus meral eath Penalty andamus/ her vil Rights ison Condition	☐ 710 Fair Lab Act [] 720 Labor/M Relation [] 730 Labor/M Reportin Disclosu [] 740 Railway [] 790 Other La Litigatio [] 791 Empl. Re	or Stan gmt. gmt. g & re Act Labor .bor n	

CV10 5160

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: ____

Case 2:10-cv-05160-GHK -CW Document 1 Filed 07/14/10 Page 20 of 20 Page ID #:24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? 🖾 No 🖂 Yes If yes, list case number(s):

VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? MNO If yes, list case number(s):

Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:

(Check all boxes that apply) = ELA. Arise from the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or

- TEB. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or
- □ C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or
- \Box D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present

IX. VENUE: (When completing the following information, use an additional sheet if necessary.)

List the County in this District; California County outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides $\{a\}$ Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).

County in this District.*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
	Coach, Inc New York Coach Services, Inc Florida		

(b) List the County in this District; California County outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).

	County in this District:*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
	All Defendants - Los Angeles	
Į		

(c) List the County in this District: California County outside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land involved.

County in this District.*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
All claims - Los Angeles	

* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Yentura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Counties

Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land involved

Date July 14, 2010 Åц X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER)

Notice to Counsel/Parties: The CV-71 (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)

Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases:

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	ША	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL.	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))