

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
SAMMY MOURABIT,

Plaintiff,

-against-

STEVEN KLEIN, STEVEN KLEIN STUDIO,
LLC, STEVEN KLEIN STUDIO, INC.,
FRANCOIS NARS, SHISEIDO INC., SHISEIDO
INTERNATIONAL d/b/a SHISEIDO AMERICAS
CORPORATION,

Defendants.

ANALISA TORRES, United States District Judge:

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: _____
DATE FILED: 9/13/2019

18 Civ. 8313 (AT)

ORDER

Plaintiff, Sammy Mourabit, brings this action against Defendants, Francois Nars, Shiseido America, Inc., Shiseido International (the “Shiseido Defendants”); Steven Klein, Steven Klein Studio, Inc., and Steven Klein Studio, LLC (the “Klein Defendants”) alleging copyright infringement under the Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*, and numerous state law claims. Am. Compl., ECF No. 12. The Shiseido Defendants and the Klein Defendants moved to dismiss the amended complaint under Rule 12(b)(6), ECF Nos. 46, 49, and for sanctions, ECF Nos. 61, 64. On July 2, 2019, the Court granted Defendants’ motions to dismiss and motions for sanctions (the “July Order”). July Order, ECF No. 84. Plaintiff’s counsel Mark Moody (“Moody”) moves for partial reconsideration of the July Order. ECF No 86. For the reasons stated below, the motion is GRANTED. Upon reconsideration, the portion of the July Order sanctioning Moody is VACATED.

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is a makeup artist. Am. Compl. ¶ 7. In 2013, he did the “makeup artistry” for an editorial to be featured in W Magazine. *Id.* ¶¶ 20–21. Defendant Steven Klein was the

photographer for the shoot. *Id.* ¶ 22. Klein and Defendant Francois Nars, a well-known makeup artist, then launched a line of makeup (“the Collection”) and used Plaintiff’s work to promote the Collection. *Id.* ¶ 1. Specifically, Defendants used the photographs taken during the W Magazine photoshoot to promote the Collection. *Id.* ¶ 23. These photos depicted Plaintiff’s makeup artistry, but did not give Plaintiff credit for his work. *Id.* ¶¶ 24, 27.

Plaintiff alleges that he obtained a copyright “in the makeup artistry” used on the model during the photoshoot. *Id.* ¶ 55. Plaintiff received a copyright for a drawing depicting the makeup used during the shoot (the “Drawing”). *See id.* (“[Plaintiff] has a copyright in the makeup artistry depicted in . . . certificate of registration No. VA 2-105-396.”); ECF No. 63-1 (copyrighted drawing); ECF No. 63-3 (copyright registration for VA 2-105-396). The copyright registration lists the date of completion as 2014. *Id.*

Plaintiff initiated this case in state court on June 10, 2018, alleging unjust enrichment, defamation, unfair competition, trade dress, false designation of origin, dilution, copyright infringement, deceptive acts and practices, tort and fraud. ECF No. 1-1. On July 11, 2019, counsel for the Klein Defendants advised Moody that “[t]he nature of your client’s contributions to my client’s photographic visual works are traditionally not protectable.” Pelosi Decl. Ex. B, ECF No. 66-2. Moody was also advised that his copyright claim lacked merit by counsel for the Shiseido Defendants. Catchart Decl. ¶ 14, ECF No. 63. On September 12, 2018, the case was removed to this Court. ECF No. 1. On September 18, 2018, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint alleging copyright infringement, unjust enrichment, and unfair competition and misappropriation. Am. Compl. Prior to November 27, 2018, Defendant Klein’s counsel had additional phone conversations with Moody in which Klein’s counsel stated that Plaintiff had no copyright claim for numerous reasons, including that it was “impossible for [defendant], who

conducted the photo shoot in 2013 to produce the photograph that is the subject of this litigation, to have had access to and copied a drawing created by [plaintiff] that was created *a year later* in 2014.” Pelosi Decl. ¶ 3, ECF No. 66. On November 27, 2018, the parties submitted a joint letter in advance of the initial pretrial conference in which Plaintiff continued to assert the validity of the copyright infringement claim and Defendants argued that the claim was not viable. ECF No. 33.

On December 3, 2018, this Court held an initial pretrial conference at which Moody stated that he would not be amending his complaint because Plaintiff was entitled to the relief sought. ECF No. 34. On December 6, 2018, the Klein Defendants filed a pre-motion letter seeking leave to file a motion to dismiss and setting forth their bases for doing so. ECF No. 37. This letter stated, among other things, “Klein could not have possibly accessed or referenced a [d]rawing created in 2014 to produce the photograph in 2013. This claim is implausible. Plaintiff’s copyright claim fails on this fact alone.” *Id.* at 2. The letter also stated that the Copyright Act would preempt Plaintiff’s state law claims. *Id.* at 3–4. On December 13, 2018, Moody filed a letter stating that “there is no copyright claim” because “[m]ake up artistry is not copyrightable.” ECF No. 38 at 2. The letter further stated that “[Plaintiff’s] copyright claim *should* be dismissed” and Plaintiff’s state law claims should not be preempted because makeup artistry is not copyrightable. *Id.* at 3. That same day, this Court issued an order stating that “[i]n light of Plaintiff’s admission, should the Klein Defendants file their anticipated motion to dismiss, the Court would likely dismiss the federal copyright claim and deny supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims.” December 13 Order, ECF No. 39. The order further directed the parties “to file a stipulation of dismissal without prejudice or a letter stating whether they would like to proceed with the motion to dismiss.” *Id.* On December 18, 2018, Moody

emailed counsel for the Klein Defendants stating that he was “prepared to file a Notice of Voluntary Dismissal.” ECF No. 74 at 9. On December 20, 2018, the Klein Defendants filed a letter stating that they wished to proceed with filing a motion to dismiss and did not “consent to filing a stipulation of dismissal” because they intended to seek sanctions and attorneys’ fees against Plaintiff. ECF No. 41. That same day, the Shiseido Defendants filed a letter similarly stating that they wished to proceed with the motion to dismiss. ECF No. 42. Plaintiff did not respond to the Court’s order.

DISCUSSION

I. Legal Standard

“The standard for granting [a motion for reconsideration] is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked—matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.” *Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995). To that end, a party may not use a motion for reconsideration to “advance new facts, issues or arguments not previously presented to the court.” *McGee v. Dunn*, 940 F. Supp. 2d 93, 100 (S.D.N.Y. 2013). Instead, motions for reconsiderations are narrowly construed in order “to ensure the finality of decisions and to prevent the practice of a losing party examining a decision and then plugging the gaps of a lost motion with additional matters.” *Henderson v. Metro. Bank & Tr. Co.*, 502 F. Supp. 2d 372, 376 (S.D.N.Y. 2007). The burden rests with the party seeking reconsideration to “demonstrate that the Court overlooked controlling decisions or factual matters that were put before it on the underlying motion.” *Davis v. The Gap, Inc.*, 186 F.R.D. 322, 324 (S.D.N.Y. 1999).

II. Analysis

To impose sanctions under 28 U.S.C. § 1927, the Court must find clear evidence that “(1) the offending party’s claims were entirely meritless and (2) the party acted for improper purposes.” *Agee v. Paramount Commc’ns, Inc.*, 114 F.3d 395, 398 (2d Cir. 1997). In the July Order, the Court found that Plaintiff’s claims were entirely meritless because “Plaintiff created the copyrighted work, the [D]rawing, after the alleged infringing photograph was created.” July Order at 15. In particular, the Copyright Application states that the work was created in 2014. ECF No. 63-3, but the Amended Complaint states that the photoshoot took place around December 15, 2013. Am. Compl. ¶ 21.

Moody moves for reconsideration on the ground that the Court overlooked his declaration submitted in support of his sanctions’ opposition brief (the “Declaration”)—specifically his representation that the Drawing was created before the alleged infringing photograph. *See* Pl. Decl. ¶ 27, ECF No. 74 (stating that the Drawing was created in 2013, and the 2014 date listed in Copyright Registration was error of copyright counsel). Moody further requested that the Court review *in camera* emails between Plaintiff, Moody, and Plaintiff’s copyright counsel. *Id.*

The Court’s prior determination that Moody’s actions were “completely without merit,” rested on the conclusion that the allegedly infringing photograph was created before the Drawing. July 16 Order at 16. In other words, the Court had concluded that the copyright infringement claim was “entirely meritless” because “[i]t is not possible to copy something that has not yet been created.” July Order at 15. In making that determination, however, the Court overlooked the statement Moody made in the Declaration and his offer to provide emails substantiating his claims for *in camera* review. Having reviewed the emails, *see* ECF No. 109, the Court no longer concludes that Moody’s actions were “so completely without merit” to

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.