

Peter R. Ginsberg (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Mitchell C. Stein (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Sullivan & Worcester LLP  
1633 Broadway, 32nd Floor  
New York, NY 10019  
Phone: 212-660-3000  
Fax: 212-660-3001  
Email: [prginsberg@sullivanlaw.com](mailto:prginsberg@sullivanlaw.com)  
Email: [mstein@sullivanlaw.com](mailto:mstein@sullivanlaw.com)

Nathaniel R. B. Koslof (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Sullivan & Worcester LLP  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, MA 02109  
Phone: 617-338-2439  
Fax: 617-338-2880  
Email: [nkoslof@sullivanlaw.com](mailto:nkoslof@sullivanlaw.com)

Renee E. Rothauge, OSB #903712  
Markowitz Herbold PC  
1455 SW Broadway, Suite 1900  
Portland, OR 97201  
Phone: 503-295-3085  
Fax: 503-323-9105  
Email: [ReneeRothauge@markowitzherbold.com](mailto:ReneeRothauge@markowitzherbold.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Counterclaim Defendant Kawhi Leonard*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION**

---

KAWHI LEONARD,  
  
Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant,  
  
v.  
  
NIKE, INC.,  
  
Defendant/Counterclaimant.

---

Case No. 3:19-cv-01586-MO

**PLAINTIFF KAWHI LEONARD'S  
RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANT AND  
COUNTERCLAIMANT NIKE, INC.'S  
MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE  
PLEADINGS**

**ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED**

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iv

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

BACKGROUND ..... 3

I. Mr. Leonard Conceived of and Created the Leonard Logo Before He Entered into the Nike Agreement. .... 3

II. Mr. Leonard Subsequently Permitted Nike to Use the Leonard Logo under His Control and Supervision..... 5

III. Nike Recognized that Mr. Leonard is the Owner of the Leonard Logo. .... 5

IV. Nike Files a Copyright Application for the Leonard Logo without Mr. Leonard’s Knowledge. .... 6

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND..... 7

ARGUMENT ..... 8

I. Legal Standard: A Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings is Limited to the Sufficiency of Pleadings..... 8

II. Nike’s Motion Does Not Challenge the Sufficiency of Mr. Leonard’s Pleadings But, Rather, Disputes Facts. .... 10

III. Mr. Leonard Adequately Pled that He Owns the Leonard Logo. .... 11

A. The Complaint Alleges that Mr. Leonard Created the Leonard Logo ..... 12

B. Mr. Leonard Has Pled that He Continues to Own the Leonard Logo..... 18

IV. Nike Is Not Entitled to Judgment as a Matter of Law on Nike’s Counterclaims. .... 23

A. The Parties Dispute Whether Nike Owns a Valid Copyright in the Leonard Logo. .... 24

B. Alternatively, Mr. Leonard’s Allegations and Affirmative Defenses Preclude an Award of Judgment in Nike’s Favor Regarding Nike’s Copyright and Breach of Contract Counterclaims..... 26

C. Mr. Leonard Did Not Fraudulently Register His Copyright..... 27

V. In the Event that the Court Finds Mr. Leonard’s Allegations Deficient, Leave to Amend is Properly Granted ..... 27

CONCLUSION..... 28

DocketAlarm

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page
<i>ABS Entm't v. CBS Corp.</i> , 908 F.3d 405, 413 (9th Cir. 2018). . . . .	11, 22
<i>Baxter v. MCA, Inc.</i> , 812 F.2d 421, 425 (9th Cir. 1987) . . . . .	16
<i>Bell v. Davis</i> , 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 223031 (D. Or. Dec. 31, 2019) . . . . .	24
<i>Brighton Collectibles, Inc. v. RK Tex. Leather Mfg.</i> , 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 177718 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2012) . . . . .	23
<i>Cafferty v. Scotti Bros. Records</i> , 969 F. Supp. 193 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) . . . . .	27
<i>Cent. Or. Indep. Health Servs. v. State</i> , 211 Or. App. 520, 156 P.3d 97 (Or. Ct. App. 2007) . . . . .	19
<i>Clark v. Chase Home Fin. LLC</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47295 (S.D. Cal. June 3, 2008) . . . . .	9
<i>DC Comics v. Towle</i> , 802 F.3d 1012, 1023 (9th Cir. 2015) . . . . .	11, 22
<i>Desire, LLC v. Manna Textiles, Inc.</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 217691 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2017) . . . . .	17
<i>Diamond Foods, Inc. v. Hottrix, LLC</i> , 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93247 (N.D. Cal. July 18, 2016) . . . . .	17
<i>Digimarc Corp. v. Verance Corp.</i> , 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 152031 (D. Or. Sept. 19, 2011) . . . . .	7
<i>Entm't Research Grp., Inc. v. Genesis Creative Grp., Inc.</i> , 122 F.3d 1211 (9th Cir. 1997) . . . . .	23
<i>Feist Publ'ns v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.</i> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991) . . . . .	11
<i>Gen. Conference Corp. of Seventh-Day Adventists v. Seventh-Day Adventist Congregational Church</i> , 887 F.2d 228 (9th Cir. 1989) . . . . .	23

Page iv

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

<i>Gold Value Int’l Textile, Inc. v. Sanctuary Clothing, LLC</i> , 925 F.3d 1140 (9th Cir. 2019) .....	25
<i>Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard Feiner &amp; Co.</i> , 896 F.2d 1542 (9th Cir. 1989) .....	8, 9
<i>In re Palmer</i> , 207 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2000) .....	21
<i>Int’l Longshore &amp; Warehouse Union, Local 40 v. Columbia Grain</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136326 (D. Or. July 21, 2014) .....	10
<i>James W. Fowler Co. v. QBE Ins. Corp.</i> , 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 106007 (D. Or. Jun. 25, 2019).....	24
<i>Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , 899 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2018) .....	12
<i>L.A. Printex Industries v. Aeropostale, Inc.</i> , 676 F.3d 841 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	12, 15
<i>Lambert Corp. v. LBJC Inc.</i> , 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83108 (C.D. Cal. Jun. 16, 2014) .....	24, 25
<i>Malibu Textiles, Inc. v. Label Lane Int’l, Inc.</i> , 922 F.3d 946 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2019) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Marchel Design, Inc. v. Best Master Enter., Inc.</i> , 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 110495 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2008) .....	13
<i>Mattel, Inc. v. MGA Entm’t, Inc.</i> , 616 F.3d 904 (9th Cir. 2010) .....	17, 18, 20
<i>McNair v. Oregon</i> , 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136125 (D. Or. Aug. 16, 2017).....	26
<i>Micro Star v. Formgen Inc.</i> , 154 F.3d 1107 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	27
<i>Mountain v. Mehron, Inc.</i> , 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 226318 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2018) .....	15
<i>N. Pac. Ins. Co. v. Hamilton</i> , 332 Or. 20, 22 P.3d 739 (Or. 2001) .....	19

# 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.