

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

ADOBE SYSTEMS INCORPORATED,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
MY CHOICE SOFTWARE, LLC, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 14-cv-02150-BLF

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
DISMISS; DENYING ALTERNATIVE  
MOTION FOR MORE DEFINITE  
STATEMENT; AND DENYING  
MOTION FOR TRANSFER**

[Re: ECF 24]

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

Plaintiff Adobe Systems, Inc. (“Adobe”) asserts trademark, copyright, and related claims against My Choice Software, LLC (“My Choice”) and two of its part-owners, Nathan Mumme (“Mumme”) and Daniel Parker (“Parker”) (collectively, “Defendants”), based upon their alleged sales of pirated, counterfeit, and otherwise unauthorized Adobe software products. Before the Court are (1) Defendants’ motion to dismiss the operative first amended complaint (“FAC”) under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6); (2) Defendants’ alternative motion for more definite statement under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(e); and (3) Defendants’ motion for transfer of venue to the Central District of California under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). The Court has considered the briefing and the oral argument presented at the hearing on November 13, 2014. For the reasons discussed below, the motion to dismiss is DENIED, the alternative motion for more definite statement is DENIED, and the motion for transfer is DENIED.

**I. BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>**

Adobe is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business in San Jose, California. Adobe develops and distributes computer software. It has

---

<sup>1</sup> The facts contained in the Background section are drawn from the FAC, the well-pled allegations of which are accepted as true for purposes of this motion.

1 gained significant common law trademark recognition of its ADOBE and ACROBAT marks, has  
 2 obtained registrations for its ADOBE and ACROBAT marks from the United States Patent and  
 3 Trademark Office, and has obtained registrations for copyrightable ADOBE ACROBAT software  
 4 and other software from the United States Copyright Office.<sup>2</sup>

5 My Choice is a limited liability company organized under the laws of California with its  
 6 principal place of business in Mission Viejo, California. My Choice was authorized to distribute  
 7 Adobe's software under certain terms pursuant to an "Adobe Partner Connection Program Reseller  
 8 Agreement" ("Agreement"). See FAC Exh. C.<sup>3</sup> Adobe claims that My Choice breached the  
 9 Agreement and infringed upon Adobe's trademarks and copyrights by ordering Adobe software  
 10 products from unauthorized distributors, selling licenses for counterfeit and/or unauthorized OEM  
 11 software products, and selling electronic software downloads without a license. Adobe asserts the  
 12 following claims against My Choice, Mumme, and Parker: (1) infringement of registered  
 13 trademarks under 15 U.S.C. § 1114; (2) false designation of origin, false or misleading  
 14 advertising, and unfair competition under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a); (3) dilution under 15 U.S.C. §  
 15 1125(c); (4) copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 501(a); (5) unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent  
 16 business practices under § 17200; and (6) breach of contract.

## 17 **II. MOTION TO DISMISS AND MOTION FOR MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT**

### 18 **A. Legal Standard**

#### 19 **1. Motion to Dismiss**

20 "A motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for failure to state a  
 21 claim upon which relief can be granted 'tests the legal sufficiency of a claim.'" *Conservation*  
 22 *Force v. Salazar*, 646 F.3d 1240, 1241-42 (9th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Navarro v. Block*, 250 F.3d  
 23 729, 732 (9th Cir. 2001)). When determining whether a claim has been stated, the Court accepts  
 24 as true all well-pled factual allegations and construes them in the light most favorable to the  
 25

26 <sup>2</sup> Non-exhaustive lists of Adobe's trademark and copyright registrations are attached to the FAC  
 27 as Exhibits A and B, respectively.

28 <sup>3</sup> Because the Agreement has been filed under seal, its terms are not discussed with specificity

1 plaintiff. *Reese v. BP Exploration (Alaska) Inc.*, 643 F.3d 681, 690 (9th Cir. 2011). However, the  
 2 Court need not “accept as true allegations that contradict matters properly subject to judicial  
 3 notice” or “allegations that are merely conclusory, unwarranted deductions of fact, or  
 4 unreasonable inferences.” *In re Gilead Scis. Sec. Litig.*, 536 F.3d 1049, 1055 (9th Cir. 2008)  
 5 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). While a complaint need not contain detailed  
 6 factual allegations, it “must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to  
 7 relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl.*  
 8 *Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A claim is facially plausible when it “allows the  
 9 court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.*

## 10 **2. Motion for More Definite Statement**

11 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(e), “[a] party may move for a more definite  
 12 statement of a pleading to which a responsive pleading is allowed but which is so vague or  
 13 ambiguous that the party cannot reasonably prepare a response.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e).  
 14 “However, motions for a more definite statement are disfavored, and ordinarily restricted to  
 15 situations where a pleading suffers from unintelligibility rather than want of detail.” *I.R. ex rel.*  
 16 *Nava v. City of Fresno*, No. 1:12-CV-00558 AWI GSA, 2012 WL 3879974, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Sept.  
 17 6, 2012) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). A Rule 12(e) motion must be denied “if  
 18 the complaint is specific enough to notify defendant of the substance of the claim being asserted,”  
 19 or “if the detail sought by a motion for a more definite statement is obtainable through the  
 20 discovery process.” *Id.*

## 21 **B. Discussion**

### 22 **1. Trademarks and Copyrights are Adequately Identified**

23 Defendants argue that Claims 1-4, Adobe’s trademark and copyright claims, “fail[] to  
 24 identify the trademarks or copyrights that Defendants purportedly infringed upon.” Mot. at 3,  
 25 ECF 24-1. The Court disagrees. The FAC alleges that on October 9, 2013, Adobe’s investigator  
 26 paid \$97.41 to buy a purported “Adobe Acrobat X Standard - PC – OEM Download” from  
 27 mychoicesoftware.com. FAC ¶ 36, ECF 17. The investigator was provided with installation

1 serial number was an “unauthorized OEM product not for resale” and thus that the sale violated  
 2 Adobe’s rights in its “A,” “ADOBE,” and “ACROBAT” word and design trademarks. *Id.* ¶ 38.  
 3 The FAC identifies, by registration number, twenty-nine specific trademarks and one copyright  
 4 allegedly violated by the sale of the download to the investigator. *Id.* When Adobe conducted  
 5 further investigation regarding Defendants, it discovered facts leading it to believe that  
 6 Defendants’ primary business is selling pirated and otherwise unauthorized downloads of Adobe’s  
 7 products and, indeed, that Defendants entered into the Agreement with Adobe to give its activities  
 8 the appearance of legitimacy. *Id.* ¶¶ 39-41.

9 The FAC describes several ways in which Defendants allegedly obtain pirated and  
 10 otherwise unauthorized versions of Adobe’s software for resale to Defendants’ customers. For  
 11 example, it is alleged that Defendants illegally copy trial versions of Adobe’s software and then  
 12 resell those trial versions as fully functioning versions to My Choice customers. *Id.* ¶¶ 42-46.  
 13 Defendants also allegedly sell OEM software directly to customers in violation of the Agreement,  
 14 which provides that the software is to be provided only in bundled sales with new purchases of  
 15 specific hardware. *Id.* ¶ 47. In addition, Defendants allegedly sell EDU products, which are to be  
 16 provided only to certain qualifying customers, to any customers who request them. *Id.* ¶ 48. The  
 17 FAC alleges, on information and belief, that in addition to the trademarks and copyrights  
 18 identified in paragraph 38, Defendants’ may have infringed Adobe’s rights in other trademarks  
 19 and copyrights, including those listed in Exhibits A and B to the FAC. *Id.* ¶ 38.

20 These allegations are more than adequate. Defendants’ argument that Adobe has identified  
 21 too many trademarks and copyrights is unpersuasive. This case is wholly distinguishable from  
 22 *Four Navy Seals v. Associated Press*, 413 F. Supp. 2d 1136, 1148 (S.D. Cal. 2005), relied upon by  
 23 Defendants, in which the court found inadequate an allegation that “at least one unidentified  
 24 photograph” out of a pool of 1,800 photographs had “been copyrighted by an unidentified ‘NAVY  
 25 SEAL ONE.’” Here, Adobe has provided the registration numbers of twenty-nine trademarks and  
 26 one copyright that Adobe contends were infringed by Defendants’ sale of a particular download to  
 27 Adobe’s investigator. To the extent that Defendants contend that not all of the identified

1 investigator, that is a factual challenge to the FAC that is not appropriately raised in the context of  
 2 a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. Moreover, Defendants have not demonstrated any impropriety in  
 3 Adobe's inclusion of appendices listing trademark and copyright registration numbers that it  
 4 believes Defendants may have infringed in *other* transactions. The inclusion of those appendices  
 5 does not render any less definite Adobe's allegations regarding the download purchased by its  
 6 investigator, and it puts Defendants on notice that Adobe will be seeking information during  
 7 discovery regarding what Adobe believes to be extremely egregious and widespread infringement  
 8 of its rights by Defendants. Adobe has described several methods by which it believes Defendants  
 9 have obtained and improperly resold Adobe software products. The fact that the precise scope of  
 10 Defendants' misconduct (if any) remains to be fleshed out in discovery does not render the FAC  
 11 inadequate.

12 Accordingly, Defendants' motion to dismiss and alternative motion for a more definite  
 13 statement based upon Adobe's asserted failure to identify the relevant trademarks and copyrights  
 14 are DENIED.

## 15 2. Breach of the Agreement is Adequately Alleged

16 Defendants argue that Claims 5-6, for violation of California's UCL and breach of  
 17 contract, respectively, "fail[] to define the nature of the breach giving rise to the purported unfair  
 18 business practices in which Defendant allegedly engaged." Mot. at 4, ECF 24-1. As an initial  
 19 matter, it is unclear why Defendants believe that a failure to allege breach of contract would be  
 20 dispositive of Adobe's UCL claim. In order to state a claim for relief under the UCL, Adobe must  
 21 allege facts showing that Defendants engaged in an "unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or  
 22 practice." Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200. "Because the statute is written in the disjunctive, it is  
 23 violated where a defendant's act or practice violates any of the foregoing prongs." *Davis v. HSBC*  
 24 *Bank Nevada, N.A.*, 691 F.3d 1152, 1168 (9th Cir. 2012). Adobe adequately has alleged claims of  
 25 unlawful conduct under the Lanham Act and the Copyright Act, as discussed above, and thus it  
 26 has alleged a violation of the UCL. Moreover, although the FAC does not identify the specific  
 27 sections of the Agreement breached by Defendants' conduct, the FAC identifies that conduct with

# 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.