

1 Staci Jennifer Riordan, SBN 232659  
Neal J. Gauger, SBN 293161  
2 **NIXON PEABODY LLP**  
555 W. Fifth Street, 46th Floor  
3 Los Angeles, CA 90013-1010  
Telephone: 213.629.6000  
4 Facsimile: 213.629.6001  
sriordan@nixonpeabody.com  
5 ngauger@nixonpeabody.com

6 Attorneys for Defendant  
7 CLUB HOUSE CREATIONS, INC.

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 MINX INTERNATIONAL, INC. d/b/a  
12 DAMASK FABRICS, a California  
Corporation,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 CLUB HOUSE CREATIONS, INC., a  
16 New York corporation, and DOES 1-10,  
inclusive,

17 Defendants.

Case No.: 2:15-cv-05645-CAS-PLA

Hon. Christina A. Snyder

**DEFENDANT CLUB HOUSE  
CREATIONS, INC.'S NOTICE OF  
MOTION AND MOTION TO  
DISMISS COMPLAINT;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT  
THEREOF**

[Filed Concurrently with Request for  
Judicial Notice; Declaration of Staci  
Jennifer Riordan; and [Proposed] Order]

Date: March 7, 2016  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Ctrm.: 5

Complaint Filed: July 24, 2015  
FAC Filed: Sept. 4, 2015  
Discovery Cutoff: None  
Trial Date: None

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Table of Contents

Page

I. INTRODUCTION .....1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS .....2

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW ON A MOTION TO DISMISS .....3

IV. THE COURT MAY TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE IN CONNECTION WITH A MOTION TO DISMISS .....4

V. THE FAC FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT AND MUST BE DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE .....4

    A. Plaintiff Must Plead Ownership of a Valid Copyright, And It Has Failed To Do So .....4

    B. Plaintiff Must Plead Access, And It Has Failed To Do So .....5

        1. Plaintiff Has Not Pled Facts Demonstrating Direct Access .....6

        2. Plaintiff Has Not Pled Access By A “Chain of Events” .....6

        3. Plaintiff Has Not Pled Access By “Widespread Dissemination” .....7

    C. Plaintiff Must Plead Substantial Similarity, And It Has Failed .....8

VI. AS A MATTER OF LAW, THE SHAPE PATTERN AND THE GARMENT ARE NOT SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR .....9

    A. The Unprotected Elements Of The Shape Pattern Must Be Filtered Out Before It Is Compared With The Garment.....10

        1. The Shape Pattern Is Substantially Similar To Shapes, Icons, Patterns, and Designs Found In The Public Domain .....10

        2. The Shape Pattern Is Not Sufficiently Original And Therefore Is Not Copyrightable .....11

            a. The Use of Triangles, Diamonds, Meander Borders, Crosses, Pyramids, and Rectangles are Unoriginal and *Scenes á Faire* in the Context of Fabric Patterns .....12

    B. To The Extent Plaintiff Has A Copyright In The Shape Pattern, It Is A “Thin Copyright” As A Matter Of Law .....15

    C. Even If This Court Determines That Plaintiff Has A “Thin Copyright,” The Shape Pattern And The Garment Are Not Virtually Identical .....16

VII. THE FAC FAILS TO STATE CLAIMS FOR EITHER CONTRIBUTORY OR VICARIOUS COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT AND MUST BE DISMISSED .....17

Table of Contents (continued)

Page

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1. The FAC Improperly Pleads Contributory Copyright Infringement and Vicarious Copyright Infringement as a Single Claim .....17

2. The FAC Fails to State a Claim for Contributory Copyright Infringement .....18

3. The FAC Fails to State a Claim for Vicarious Copyright Infringement.....19

VIII. CONCLUSION.....20

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**FEDERAL CASES**

*Aliotti v. R. Daktin & Co.*,  
831 F. 2d 898 (9th Cir. 1987).....10

*Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
82 F. Supp. 616, 625 (N.D. Cal. 1995).....18

*Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
35 F. 3d 1435 (9th Cir. 1994).....8, 15

*Art Attacks Ink, LLC v. MGA Entertainment Inc.*, 581 F. 3d 1138  
(9th Cir. 2009).....6, 7

*Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*,  
550 U. S. 544, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 167 L. Ed. 2d 929 (2007)..... passim

*Berkic v. Crichton*,  
761 F. 3d 1289 (9th Cir. 1985) .....4

*Bill Diodato Photography, LLC v. Kate Spade, LLC*,  
388 F. Supp. 2d 382 (S.D. N.Y. 2005) .....13

*Bissoon-Dath v. Sony Comp. Entm’t America Inc.*,  
694 F. Supp. 2d 1071 (N. D. Cal. 2010) .....8

*Bridgeman Art Library, Ltd. v. Corel Corp.*,  
36 F. Supp. 2d 191, 197 (S.D.N.Y 1999).....9, 11

*Campbell v. The Walt Disney Co.*,  
718 F. Supp. 2d 1108 (N. D. Cal 2010).....10

*Cavalier v. Random House, Inc.*  
297 F. 3d 815 (9th Cir. 2002).....5, 10

*Clegg v. Cult Awareness Network*,  
18 F. 3d 752 (9th Cir. 1994).....3

*Domingo Cambeiro Prof’l Corp. v. Advent*,  
211 F.3d 1273, 2000 WL 262597 (9th Cir. 2000) .....9, 12

1 *Dumas v. Kipp*,  
 2 90 F. 3d 386 (9th Cir. 1996).....4  
 3 *Ellison Educ. Equip., Inc. v. Tekservices, Inc.*,  
 4 903 F. Supp. 1350 (D. Neb. 1995).....9, 12  
 5 *Erickson v. Blake*,  
 6 839 F. Supp. 2d 1132 (D. Or. 2012).....10  
 7 *Ets-Hokin v. Skyy Spirit, Inc.*  
 8 225 F. 3d 1068 (9th Cir. 2000) .....12, 16  
 9 *Express, LLC v. Fetish Group, Inc.*,  
 10 424 F. Supp. 2d 1211 (2006).....16  
 11 *Fonovisa, Inc. v. Cherry Auction, Inc.*,  
 12 76 F. 3d 259 (9th Cir. 1996).....19, 20  
 13 *Frank Music Corp. v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.*,  
 14 886 F.2d 1545 (9th Cir. 1989) .....19  
 15 *Frybarger v. International Business Machines Corp.*  
 16 812 F.2d 525 (9th Cir. 1987).....13  
 17 *Funky Films, Inc. v. Time Warner Entertainment, Inc.*  
 18 462 F. 3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2006) .....8, 9  
 19 *In re Stac Electronics Securities Litigation*,  
 20 89 F. 3d 1399 (9th Cir. 1996).....4  
 21 *Iqbal v. Ashcroft*,  
 22 556 U.S. 662 (2009) ..... passim  
 23 *Jackson v. Carey*,  
 24 353 F. 3d 750 (9th Cir. 2003).....4  
 25 *Jason v. Fonda*,  
 26 698 F. 2d 966 (9th Cir. 1982).....5, 7, 8  
 27 *Kouf v. Walt Disney Pictures & Television*,  
 28 16 F. 3d 1042 (9th Cir. 1994).....10  
*L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.*,  
 676 F. 3d 841 (9th Cir. 2012).....4

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.