

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

TIANHAI LACE CO., LTD.; TIANHAI LACE
(GUANGDONG) LTD.; and TIANHAI LACE
USA INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ASOS, PLC.; ASOS.COM LIMITED; ASOS US
SALES LLC,

Defendants.

22-CV-9752 (RA)

MEMORANDUM
OPINION & ORDER

RONNIE ABRAMS, United States District Judge:

Plaintiffs, several entities of Tianhai Lace Company, brought this action alleging that Defendants, entities of ASOS, used Plaintiffs’ protected lace designs in various clothing products, and asserting claims for copyright infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 501, *et seq.*, and under the New York Deceptive Trade Practices Act, New York General Business Law § 349, *et seq.* (the “DPA”). Now before the Court is Defendants’ motion to dismiss the Complaint. For the reasons that follow, the motion is denied with respect to the copyright infringement claims but granted with respect to the claims brought under the DPA.

BACKGROUND

The following facts are drawn from the Complaint, and are accepted as true for purposes of the present motion. *See Stadnick v. Vivint Solar, Inc.*, 861 F.3d 31, 35 (2d Cir. 2017).

Plaintiffs allege that they have “designed, manufactured, and sold decorative laces” for “more than thirty years,” “enjoy[ing] tremendous commercial success in the fashion industry.” Compl. ¶ 14. Given their extensive lace portfolio, Plaintiffs allege that they have developed and sold original lace designs which are copyrightable subject matter under 17 U.S.C. § 101, *et seq.*,

and today own some 22,500 lace designs manufactured for sale in 30 countries across the globe. *Id.* ¶¶ 15, 20. Plaintiffs allege they are the owners U.S. Copyright Office Registrations for five specific lace designs which are relevant to the present action. *Id.* ¶ 16; *id.*, Ex. A (Registration Certificates for Copyright Nos. VA 1-971-441, VA 2-293-81, VA 1-847-129, VA 1-861-878, and VA 1-791-176).

Defendants are alleged to have “systematically and without authorization reproduced, displayed, distributed, created derivative works of, and otherwise infringed” these five lace designs by offering clothing products for sale which feature the protected designs. *Id.* ¶ 30. Plaintiffs’ investigators “placed multiple orders for” the allegedly infringing products between February 2020 and May 2022, and, upon receiving them, “confirmed that none of the laces included in Defendants’ [] [p]roducts were genuine Tianhai laces.” *Id.* ¶ 31. The Complaint includes a detailed, five-page table showing Plaintiffs’ registered lace designs in the left-most column, Defendants’ allegedly infringing products in the center column, and Plaintiffs’ copyright registration number for the protected design. *Id.* ¶ 32. Moreover, the Complaint attaches “photos of the purchased Infringing Products,” complete with receipts and email confirmations from ASOS, as Exhibit E.

Despite cease-and-desist letters sent beginning in May 2022, Plaintiffs have not received a substantive response from Defendants regarding the alleged infringement. *Id.* ¶¶ 34–41. Instead, Defendants allegedly “continue to reproduce, display, distribute, create derivative works of, and otherwise infringe the Tianhai Lace Designs in the U.S. and multiple countries through the ASOS E-Commerce Platforms,” resulting in lost sales and licensing income. *Id.* ¶¶ 42–44. Accordingly, Plaintiffs brought this action in November 2022, *see* Dkt. 1, Defendants moved to dismiss in February 2023, *see* Dkt. 25, and the motion was fully briefed in March 2023, *see* Dkt. 31.

LEGAL STANDARD

“To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 554, 570 (2007)). “A claim has facial plausibility 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.* (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). The Court must accept as true all factual allegations and draw all reasonable inferences in Plaintiffs’ favor, *see Goldstein v. Pataki*, 516 F.3d 50, 56 (2d Cir. 2008), but it need not credit “mere conclusory statements,” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555). “While a complaint attacked by a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss does not need detailed factual allegations, a plaintiff’s obligation to provide the grounds of his entitlement to relief requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (internal citations and alterations omitted). Courts may consider documents incorporated into the complaint when analyzing motions brought under Rule 12(b)(6), including “any written instrument attached to [the complaint] as an exhibit, materials incorporated in [the complaint] by reference, and documents that, although not incorporated by reference, are ‘integral’ to the complaint.” *Sira v. Morton*, 380 F.3d 57, 67 (2d Cir. 2004) (cleaned up) (collecting cases).

DISCUSSION

Defendants argue, first, that the claim for copyright infringement should be dismissed because the Complaint fails to provide Defendants “fair notice of which products infringe which of Plaintiffs’ Claimed Copyrights,” Mot. at 2; and, second, that the claim brought under New York’s DPA should be dismissed because it is preempted by federal copyright law, *id.* at 2–3. The

court disagrees with Defendants as to the former argument, but agrees as to the latter.

I. The Complaint’s Copyright Infringement Allegations are Sufficiently Specific

A complaint for copyright infringement must provide the defendant fair notice of the nature of the alleged infringement. *Ino, Inc. v. Needle & Threads of West Palm Beach, Inc.*, 2020 WL 7343037, at *2–3 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 14, 2020). In this district, courts have held that a complaint alleging copyright infringement includes such fair notice where it states: “(1) which specific original works are the subject of the copyright claim, (2) that [the] plaintiff owns the copyrights in those works, (3) that the copyrights have been registered in accordance with the statute, and (4) by what acts during what time the defendant infringed the copyright.” *Kelly v. L.L. Cool J.*, 145 F.R.D. 32, 36 (S.D.N.Y. 1992), *aff’d*, 23 F.3d 398 (2d Cir. 1994); *see also Energy Intel. Grp. Inc. v. Jeffries, LLC*, 101 F. Supp. 3d 332, 338 (S.D.N.Y. 2015) (observing that the Southern District of New York applies “the *Kelly* court’s four-prong test to determine whether a claim of copyright infringement satisfies the requirements of Rule 8”); *Cole v. John Wiley & Sons*, 2012 WL 3133520, at *11–13 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 1, 2012) (same). Allegations of infringing acts under the fourth *Kelly* prong must be “set out with some specificity.” *Lindsay v. R.M.S. Titanic*, 1999 WL 816163, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 13, 1999). This does not present a “heighted pleading” standard, but is one fully embraced under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, which mandates that a plaintiff provide a “short and plain statement of the claim” in his complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). Because “to survive a motion to dismiss, a plaintiff’s facts must give rise to a plausible narrative supporting his claim,” *Warren v. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.*, 952 F. Supp. 2d 610, 615 (S.D.N.Y. 2013), a complaint in copyright infringement actions must do more than simply “rest on bare-bones allegations that infringement occurred,” *Jacobs v. Carnival Corp.*, 2009 WL 856637, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 25, 2009).

The parties do not dispute that Plaintiffs properly pleaded facts in the Complaint satisfying the first three prongs of the *Kelly* analysis. First, the Complaint identifies U.S. Copyright Registration Numbers VA 1-971-441, VA 2-293-81, VA 1-847-129, VA 1-861-878, and VA 1-791-176 as the specific protected lace designs that the Defendants purportedly infringed, and further includes a detailed chart displaying these copyrighted lace designs alongside images of Defendants’ purported infringement. Compl. ¶¶ 16, 32. Second, Plaintiffs allege ownership of those design copyrights, as well as, third, that they were properly registered prior to the commencement of this action, as required by the statute. *See* Compl., Ex. A; *see also* *Exceller Software Corp. v. Pearson Educ., Inc.*, 2010 WL 4486944, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 9, 2010) (“The Amended Complaint alleges that Exceller owns and has registered the source code []. This is sufficient to satisfy the first three [] requirements.”).

Defendants argue in their motion to dismiss, however, that the Complaint fails to allege copyright infringement with sufficient particularity to satisfy the fourth *Kelly* prong, which requires that Plaintiffs identify “by what acts during what time the defendant infringed the copyright[s]” at issue. *Kelly*, 145 F.R.D. at 36. The Court disagrees. Here, the Complaint includes a detailed table with “close-up portions of what appears to be nine different products” manufactured and sold by Defendants beside Plaintiffs’ copyrighted lace designs. Compl. ¶ 32. And as to Defendants’ insistence that this table leaves them unable to identify their own purportedly infringing products, the Complaint *further* directs to an attached Exhibit E, which includes Defendants’ own product web pages listing the specific product names—used in commerce *by Defendants*—for each of the allegedly infringing products. *See* Compl., Ex. E1 (showing “ASOS DESIGN Curve Rosie lace underwired bodysuit in red,” “ASOS DESIGN soft mini skater dress in floral print with eyelash lace,” and “ASOS DESIGN long sleeve pencil dress

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.