

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----  
MMS TRADING COMPANY PTY LTD., *an*  
*Australian Company d/b/a Connetix Tiles,*

Plaintiff,

**MEMORANDUM & ORDER**  
20-CV-1360 (MKB)

v.

HUTTON TOYS, LLC, *a New York limited liability*  
*company,*

Defendants.

-----  
MARGO K. BRODIE, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff MMS Trading Company Pty Ltd. commenced the above-captioned action against Defendant Hutton Toys LLC, among others,<sup>1</sup> on March 13, 2020, alleging that Defendant fraudulently filed a copyright infringement complaint against Plaintiff on Amazon.com based on an invalid copyright in magnetic tile toys, resulting in the removal of Plaintiff's product from Amazon and a loss of sales and goodwill. (Compl. ¶ 1, Docket Entry No. 1.) On March 6, 2023, the Court granted in part and denied in part the parties' summary judgment motions ("March 2023 Decision"). (Mar. 2023 Decision, Docket Entry No. 75.) On April 5, 2023, Plaintiff filed a letter motion for reconsideration styled as a motion for clarification of the Court's opinion. (Pl.'s Letter Mot. for Clarification ("Pl.'s Mot."), Docket Entry No. 79.) For the reasons set forth below, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion.

<sup>1</sup> The Complaint also named 18th Avenue Toys Ltd. and Yaacov Schwartz as defendants, but they are no longer parties to the case. (Stipulation of Dismissal, Docket Entry No. 12.)

## I. Background

In the March 2023 Decision, the Court denied Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment on its copyright invalidity claim. The Court found that Defendant had established a rebuttable presumption that its copyright was valid and original. (Mar. 2023 Decision 8–11.) The Court further found that Plaintiff failed to rebut the presumption because although there was a disputed issue of material fact regarding whether the copyright was “purely” functional, the Court did not find that there was a dispute regarding its originality or that the copyright was invalidated because the subject matter was identical to a prior design patent. (*Id.* at 11–22.)

With respect to Defendant’s cross-motion for summary judgment on Plaintiff’s copyright invalidity claim, the Court found that Defendant presented evidence of a valid copyright and therefore, the burden of overcoming the presumption of validity shifted to Plaintiff to be rebutted. (*Id.* at 28–31.) The Court found that Plaintiff failed to show that the copyright was invalid because Plaintiff did not show that the Defendant failed to disclose material facts to the copyright office or that Defendant misled the copyright office. (*Id.*)

On April 5, 2023, Plaintiff filed the motion seeking clarification of the Court’s decision denying Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment on its copyright invalidity claim, granting Defendant’s motion for summary judgment on the same claim and allowing the copyright infringement and noninfringement claims to proceed to trial. (Pl.’s Mot.) Specifically, Plaintiff argues that because the Court found that a factual dispute regarding the functionality of Defendant’s allegedly infringing work precluded summary judgment in favor of Plaintiff on the copyright invalidity claim, then the Court should have also denied summary judgment to Defendant on the same claim and for the same reason. (*Id.*)

In opposing Plaintiff's application, Defendant argues that (1) the letter motion is untimely under Local Rule 6.3 and Rule 59 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; (2) Rule 60(a) is inapplicable because the ruling does not contain any "clerical errors;" and (3) Rule 60(b) is inapplicable because the ruling was not a final judgment and because Plaintiff cannot otherwise show that Rule 60(b) applies. (Def.'s Reply in Opp'n to Pl.'s Mot. ("Def.'s Opp'n") 1–3, Docket Entry No. 80.) In addition, Defendant argues that the Court did not err in its analysis. (*Id.*)

## **II. Discussion**

The Court denies Plaintiff's motion as untimely under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules. In addition, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion on the merits.

### **a. Plaintiff's motion is procedurally untimely**

Plaintiff does not cite any Federal Rule of Civil Procedure as a basis for its letter but simply calls it a motion for clarification. Defendant argues that Plaintiff's motion is untimely because: (1) "[a] motion for relief under Rule 59(e) must be brought within 28-days of the entry of the judgment being challenged," and (2) "under Local Rule 6.3, . . . notice of motion for reconsideration or reargument of a court order determining a motion shall be served within fourteen days after the entry of the court's order resulting in judgment." (*Id.* at 2.) Defendant notes that Plaintiff's letter motion was filed after the deadlines passed and therefore is untimely. (*Id.*) In addition, Defendant argues that Rule 60(a) is inapplicable because the Court's March 2023 Decision does not contain any clerical errors and reflects the Court's intent. (*Id.*)

First, Plaintiff's letter is untimely under Rule 59 and Local Rule 6.3. Under Rule 59(e), "[a] motion to alter or amend a judgment must be filed no later than [twenty-eight] days after the entry of the judgment." Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). Under Local Rule 6.3, a notice of motion for reconsideration must be filed within fourteen days after the entry of the order. Plaintiff filed the

letter on April 5, 2023, thirty days after the Court's March 6, 2023 ruling. Therefore, Plaintiff's letter motion was untimely under both Rule 59(e) and Local Rule 6.3. *See, e.g., Siino v. City of New York*, No. 14-CV-7217, 2021 WL 6063610, at \*3 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2021) (denying as untimely pro se plaintiff's motion to reconsider which was filed twenty-six days after the order was entered); *Bennett v. Care Corr. Sol. Med. Contracted*, No. 15-CV-3746, 2017 WL 4250519, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 25, 2017) (denying as untimely plaintiff's seven-day-late motion for reconsideration and collecting cases).

Second, Rule 60(a) does not apply. Rule 60(a) states, "[t]he court may correct a clerical mistake or a mistake arising from oversight or omission whenever one is found in a judgment, order, or other part of the record." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a); *Wang v. Int'l Bus. Machs. Corp.*, 839 F. App'x 643, 645 (2d Cir. 2021) (same). "Rule 60(a) 'is not meant to provide a way for parties to . . . charge errors in what a court has deliberately done.'" *PDV Sweeny, Inc. v. ConocoPhillips Co.*, No. 14-CV-5183, 2015 WL 9413880, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2015), *aff'd*, 670 F. App'x 23 (2d Cir. 2016) (quoting *Emp'rs Mut. Cas. Co. v. Key Pharm., Inc.*, 886 F. Supp. 360, 363 (S.D.N.Y. 1995)); *see also* 11 Charles Alan Wright et al., *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2854 (3d ed. 2012) ("Errors of a more substantial nature are to be corrected by a motion under Rules 59(e) or 60(b)."). Plaintiff does not allege any clerical error because there are none. As Defendant argues, the Court found that Plaintiff failed to establish the invalidity of the '106 Copyright because Defendant established a rebuttable presumption of the validity of the copyright; and Plaintiff failed to rebut that presumption.

Third, Rule 60(b) does not apply. Pursuant to Rule 60(b),

[o]n motion and just terms, the court may relieve a party or its legal representative from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for the following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable

diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or (6) any other reason that justifies relief.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Rule 60(b) only applies to final judgments. *See Transaero, Inc. v. La Fuerza Aerea Boliviana*, 99 F.3d 538, 541 (2d Cir.1996) (“By its own terms, Rule 60(b) applies only to judgments that are final.”). An order denying in part and granting in part the parties’ motions for summary judgment is not final. *See United States v. 228 Acres of Land*, 916 F.2d 808, 811 (2d Cir. 1990) (“An order that denies summary judgment or grants partial summary judgment cannot by itself be the basis for an appeal, since it is nonfinal.”); *Williams v. Cnty. of Nassau*, 779 F. Supp. 2d 276, 280 n.2 (E.D.N.Y. 2011), *aff’d*, 581 F. App’x 56 (2d Cir. 2014) (same). In addition, none of the Rule 60(b) grounds apply. Plaintiff does not argue that there is newly discovered evidence, fraud, or new law requiring reconsideration of the Court’s decision.

Therefore, Plaintiff’s motion is untimely under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules, and Rule 60(b) does not apply to Plaintiff’s motion.

**b. Plaintiff’s motion also fails on the merits**

Plaintiff argues that the March 2023 Decision is inconsistent as it relates to the parties’ motions for summary judgment on Plaintiff’s copyright infringement claim. In support, Plaintiff argues that because the Court found that “there is a genuine issue of material fact concerning the functional element portion of Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment,” with regard to Plaintiff’s copyright invalidity claim, then that means “this issue also exists concerning Defendant’s motion for summary judgment on Plaintiff’s copyright invalidation claim.” (Pl.’s Mot. 3.) Plaintiff argues that “it is also possible that a reasonable juror could identify the product as not containing [artistic] qualities” such that its copyright invalidation claim should be allowed

# 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.