

Plaintiff,

v.

REVOLT MEDIA & TV, LLC, RAHMAN
DUKES, JOHN DOES 1-10, and ABC CORP. 1-
10,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 17-2217
(JMV) (MF)

OPINION

John Michael Vazquez, U.S.D.J.

This matter concerns allegations of breach of contract, unjust enrichment, and copyright infringement. Plaintiff Walter Hall (“Plaintiff”) claims that he created music for Defendants’ television show but Defendants thereafter breached the parties’ agreement and infringed Plaintiff’s copyright. Currently pending before the Court is the motion of Defendants Revolt Media & TV, LLC and Rahman Dukes (collectively, “Defendants”) to dismiss the Complaint. D.E. 10. The Court reviewed the parties’ submissions¹ and decided the motion without oral argument pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b) and L. Civ. R. 78.1(b). For the reasons set forth below, Defendants’ motion to dismiss is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part.

¹ The following briefs were submitted in connection with this motion: Defendants’ Brief, D.E. 10, (“Def. Br.”); Plaintiff’s Opposition, D.E. 15, (“Opp.”); and Defendants’ Reply, D.E. 16, (“Reply Br.”).

at ¶ 2. Defendant Rahman Dukes (“Dukes”) was the Vice President of Revolt at all relevant times. *Id.* at ¶ 3.

In August and September of 2013, Plaintiff provided Revolt with a number of original songs. *Id.* at ¶ 10. Later that year, Revolt began using one of the songs on its show “The Gate of Revolt.” *Id.* at ¶ 11. Upon learning that Revolt was using the song, Plaintiff reached out to Dukes in hopes of obtaining a contract that would govern Revolt’s use of the song. *Id.* at ¶ 12. Although he initially responded positively to the idea, Dukes later informed Plaintiff that Revolt would be unable to follow through with contract negotiations because its legal team had not yet been assembled. *Id.* at ¶¶ 13-14. In response, Plaintiff forwarded Dukes a sample agreement. *Id.* at ¶ 15. Dukes ignored the proposed agreement and sent Plaintiff \$700, advising Plaintiff that additional payments would be made once an agreement was executed. *Id.* at ¶ 16; Ex. A-C to Def. Br. Dukes also assured Plaintiff that he would provide him with Revolt merchandise and additional work. Compl. at ¶ 16. When several months passed with no word from Revolt, Plaintiff attempted to contact Dukes about negotiating an agreement. *Id.* at ¶ 17. However, Dukes ignored all of Plaintiff’s efforts while continuing to use the song on Revolt’s show through April of 2015. *Id.* at ¶¶ 17-18.

Plaintiff filed the Complaint on April 3, 2017. D.E. 1. Plaintiff’s Complaint contains three counts: Count One for breach of contract/bad faith conduct; Count Two for unjust enrichment; and Count Three for copyright infringement. Compl. at ¶¶ 8-28. Plaintiff seeks both monetary and

fails “to state a claim upon which relief can be granted[.]” For a complaint to survive dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6), it must contain sufficient factual matter to state a claim that is plausible on its face. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A claim is facially plausible “when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* Further, a plaintiff must “allege sufficient facts to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will uncover proof of her claims.” *Connelly v. Lane Const. Corp.*, 809 F.3d 780, 789 (3d Cir. 2016). In evaluating the sufficiency of a complaint, district courts must separate the factual and legal elements. *Fowler v. UPMC Shadyside*, 578 F.3d 203, 210-211 (3d Cir. 2009). Restatements of the elements of a claim are legal conclusions, and therefore, not entitled to a presumption of truth. *Burtch v. Milberg Factors, Inc.*, 662 F.3d 212, 224 (3d Cir. 2011). The court, however, “must accept all of the complaint’s well-pleaded facts as true.” *Fowler*, 578 F.3d at 210. Even if plausibly pled, however, a complaint will not withstand a motion to dismiss if the facts alleged do not state “a legally cognizable cause of action.” *Turner v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.*, No. 14-7148, 2015 WL 12826480, at *2 (D.N.J. Jan. 23, 2015).

III. Analysis

As an initial matter, Plaintiff argues that by relying on the invoice Plaintiff sent to Defendants, Ex. A-C to Def. Br., Defendants have effectively converted their motion to dismiss into a motion for summary judgment. Opp. at 2. When a litigant relies on matters outside of the

Complaint because Plaintiff specifically relies on it to support his claim that a contract existed between himself and Defendants. Compl. at ¶ 16. Thus, the Court can consider the invoice as part of Defendants' motion to dismiss. Additionally, even without the invoice, Plaintiff still does not state a plausible cause of action as to Counts One and Three. Therefore, the Court will continue to treat this motion as a motion to dismiss.

a. Breach of Contract

To state a claim for breach of contract, a plaintiff must allege (1) the existence of the contract; (2) breach of the contract; (3) damages as a result of the breach; and (4) that the plaintiff performed its own duties under the contract. *Faistl v. Energy Plus Holdings, LLC*, 2012 WL 3535815, at *7 (D.N.J. Sept. 4, 2012). A contract exists when there was a meeting of the minds, there was an offer and acceptance, there was consideration, and there was certainty in the terms of the agreement. *Allen v. Bloomingdale's, Inc.*, 225 F.Supp.3d 254, 258 (D.N.J. Dec. 21, 2016). Acceptance of a contract must be absolute and unequivocal. *Kristensons Petroleum, Inc. v. Explorer Maritime Cruises, LLC*, 2018 WL 497070, at *6 (D.N.J. Jan 22, 2018). The consideration must be a bargained-for exchange of promises or performances. *Hackensack University Medical Center v. Yinglian Xiao*, 2018 WL 2095598, at *5 (D.N.J. May 7, 2018) (citing Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 71 (1981)). These required elements apply to both express and implied contracts. *Gardiner v. V.I. Water & Power Auth.*, 145 F.3d 635, 644 (3d Cir. 1988). If the court finds that the plaintiff sufficiently pleaded the existence of a contract, “[t]he plaintiff must also

discussing the possibility of negotiating a contract but that one was never finalized. Compl. at ¶¶ 12-17. For example, Plaintiff indicates that he “contacted Defendant Dukes to craft a contract,” *id.* at ¶ 12; that he sent Dukes a draft contract which was not executed, *id.* at ¶¶ 15-16; and that “[a]fter several months without any movement by Revolt, the Plaintiff again attempted to contact Dukes to work the terms of his agreement,” *id.* at ¶ 17. The Complaint does not plausibly allege that any contract was accepted by Defendants. The Complaint also fails to plausibly plead that the alleged agreement had sufficiently certain terms, such as the scope of Defendants’ use of the song or the amount Plaintiff was to be paid. As a result, because there were no definitive terms, Plaintiff fails to adequately identify specific portions of the alleged contract which were breached. The Complaint alleges discussions of future contract negotiations rather than a final agreement. Therefore, Plaintiff has failed to adequately plead the existence of a contract or a breach of that contract.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court dismisses Plaintiff’s breach of contract claim in Count One.

b. Breach of the Covenant of Good Faith & Fair Dealing

The implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing is a “component of every contract” that requires both parties to a contract act in “good faith[,]” that is, they must “adher[e] to ‘community standards of decency, fairness, or reasonableness.’” *Iliadis v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 191 N.J. 88, 109 (2007) (internal citations omitted). Good faith “requires a party to refrain from

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.