

O

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11
12 ROMEX TEXTILES, INC., a
13 California Corporation,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16
17 HK WORLDWIDE, LLC, d/b/a
18 HOT KISS, a New York
19 Limited Liability Company;
20 APOLLO APPAREL NY, LLC, a
21 New York Limited Liability
22 Company; ROSS STORES, INC.,
23 a Delaware Corporation; R&R
24 GOLDMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.,
25 d/b/a DISCOVERY CLOTHING
26 COMPANY, an Illinois
27 Corporation; SPECIALTY
28 RETAILERS, INC., a Texas
Corporation; BEALL'S OUTLET
STORES, INC., a Florida
Corporation; and DOES 1-10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

CV 18-06543-RSWL-AGR

ORDER re: Defendants'
Motion for Summary
Judgment [63]

Plaintiff Romex Textiles, Inc. ("Plaintiff") brings
this copyright infringement Action against Defendants

1 Apollo Apparel NY, LLC; Ross Stores, Inc.; R&R Goldman
 2 Associates, Inc., d/b/a Discovery Clothing Company;
 3 Specialty Retailers, Inc.; Beall's Outlet Stores, Inc.;
 4 and Does 1 through 10 (collectively, "Defendants").¹
 5 Am. Compl., ECF No. 46. Currently before the Court is
 6 Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment ("Motion")
 7 [63]. Having reviewed all papers submitted pertaining
 8 to this Motion, the Court **NOW FINDS AND RULES AS**
 9 **FOLLOWS:** the Court **DENIES** Defendants' Motion.

10 11 I. BACKGROUND

12 A. Factual Background

13 Plaintiff is a California corporation. Am. Compl.
 14 ¶ 4. Defendants are a series of corporations domiciled
 15 in New York, Delaware, Illinois, Texas, and Florida.
 16 Id. ¶¶ 6-10. Plaintiff is the owner and author of a
 17 two-dimensional artwork (the "Subject Design") called
 18 "AE_T1697" under the title of work "AE Design Studio 3-
 19 31-2014". Decl. of Shawn Binafard ("Binafard Decl.")
 20 ISO Pl.'s Opp'n ¶ 4, ECF No. 67-1. On March 31, 2014,
 21 Plaintiff was granted a copyright for the Subject
 22 Design, with Registration No. VA 1-903-180. Pl.'s
 23 Opp'n, Ex. A ("Subject Design Registration"), ECF No.
 24 67-3. The Subject Design is a floral design, which is
 25 depicted below. Defs.' Mot. for Summ. J. ("Mot."), Ex.

26
 27 ¹ Plaintiff initially included HK Worldwide, LLC as a
 28 Defendant in this Action. HK Worldwide, LLC was dismissed
 without prejudice by stipulation on March 25, 2019. ECF No. 53.

B (the "Subject Design"), ECF No. 67-4.



Plaintiff alleges that Defendants manufactured, purchased, sold, or marketed two garments (the "Accused Designs") which infringe the Subject Design. The two allegedly infringing garments are depicted below, and entitled Version 1 and Version 2, respectively.

Version 1



Version 2



Mot., Ex. C ("Accused Designs"), ECF No. 63-5.

Defendants deny that they infringed the Subject Design, and bring this Motion alleging that they are entitled to judgment as a matter of law because the Subject Design and Accused Designs are not substantially similar. See generally Mot.

B. Procedural Background

Plaintiff filed its Complaint [1] on July 30, 2018 and then filed its Amended Complaint [46] on March 6, 2019. Defendants timely filed their Answers to the Amended Complaint [55-59], denying Plaintiff's allegations and asserting affirmative defenses, including lack of substantial similarity between the Subject Design and Accused Designs.

On May 28, 2019, Defendants filed the instant Motion for Summary Judgment [63], alleging that the Subject Design and Accused Designs are not

1 substantially similar. Plaintiff filed its Opposition
2 on June 4, 2019 [67]. Defendants filed their Reply
3 [68] on June 10, 2019. Plaintiff then filed a Sur-
4 Reply [69] in support of its Opposition, in which
5 Plaintiff filed evidentiary objections to Defendants'
6 Reply, responses to Defendants' evidentiary objections,
7 and a Statement of Controverted Facts. Defendants
8 filed an Objection to Plaintiff's Sur-Reply on June 17,
9 2019 [70].

10 II. DISCUSSION

11 A. Legal Standard

12 Summary judgment should be granted "if the movant
13 shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any
14 material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as
15 a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). A fact is
16 "material" for purposes of summary judgment if it might
17 affect the outcome of the suit, and a "genuine" issue
18 exists if the evidence is such that a reasonable fact-
19 finder could return a verdict for the nonmovant.

20 Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 244, 248
21 (1986). The evidence, and any inferences based on
22 underlying facts, must be viewed in the light most
23 favorable to the nonmovant. Twentieth Century-Fox Film
24 Corp. v. MCA, Inc., 715 F.2d 1327, 1328-29 (9th Cir.
25 1983). In ruling on a motion for summary judgment, the
26 court's function is not to weigh the evidence, but only
27 to determine if a genuine issue of material fact
28 exists. Anderson, 477 U.S. at 255.

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.