

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

Music City Metals Co., Inc.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Jingchang Cai d/b/a Xincheng Company, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 3:17-cv-00766

Judge Aleta A. Trauger

Magistrate Judge Chip Frensley

DEFENDANTS SHENZHEN HAI PAI INTERNATIONAL WAREHOUSING SERVICES LIMITED, HIPACKING, INC., JOLYN LIU, CHUGANG GUAN, JIA NING LIU, HYCO INTERNATIONAL TRADING COMPANY LP, BLOOM INTERNATIONAL, INC., FENG BAI, AND GUANGZHOU HONGSHUO TRADING CO., LTD.'S RESPONSE TO THE COURT'S ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
I. MCM.....	3
II. Selling Products on Amazon and eBay.....	4
III. The Hyco Defendants.	6
A. Jolyn Liu and Chugang Guan.	6
B. HiPacking, Inc.....	7
C. Shenzhen Hai Pai International Warehousing Services Limited.	7
D. Hyco International Trading Company LP.....	8
E. Feng Bai and Bloom International, Inc.....	8
F. Guangzhou Hongshuo Trading Co., Ltd.....	9
IV. MCM’s Prior Cases Before This Court.	9
V. MCM’s Unreasonable Delay in Bringing this Action for Immediate and Extreme Relief.	10
ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY	13
I. Legal Standard for the Extraordinary Relief of a Preliminary Injunction.	13
II. MCM is Not Likely to Succeed on the Merits.....	13
A. MCM’s Trademark Claims Fail Because the Challenged Uses are Descriptive of MCM’s Products, Not Infringing Indicators of Source.	13
1. The Challenged Uses of the MCM mark and Part Numbers Constitute Nominative Fair Use and Do Not Identify MCM as the Source of the Grill Parts at Issue.....	15
2. The Part Numbers Are Descriptive of the Parts, Do Not Function as Source Identifiers, and Cannot be Protected as Trademarks....	20
B. MCM’s Copyright Claims Fail Because the Individual Elements in MCM’s Catalog are Not Entitled to Copyright Protection.	22
1. The Grill Manufacturers’ Brand, Fitment Data and Model Numbers are Facts Ineligible for Copyright Protection.....	24
2. The Illustrations and Photos in MCM’s Catalog Are Insufficiently Original to Warrant Copyright Protection.	25
3. MCM’s Part Numbers are Functional, Lack Originality, and Constitute Short Phrases for Which Copyright is Denied.	26

III.	MCM’s Unreasonable Delay Demonstrates that it Will Not Suffer Irreparable Injury if its Motion is Denied.	27
IV.	Issuing a Preliminary Injunction Will Cause Substantial Harm to the Hyco Defendants.	29
V.	A Preliminary Injunction is Not in the Public Interest.	30
VI.	Bond.	30
CONCLUSION		30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Advisory Info. & Mgmt. Sys., Inc. v. Prime Comput., Inc.</i> , 598 F. Supp. 76 (M.D. Tenn. 1984)	28
<i>AmMed Direct, LLC v. Liberty Med. Supply, Inc.</i> , No. 3:09-00288, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 87518 (M.D. Tenn. Sep. 23, 2009)	13, 29
<i>ATC Distrib. Grp., Inc. v. Whatever It Takes Transmissions & Parts, Inc.</i> , 402 F.3d 700 (6th Cir. 2005).....	25, 26
<i>Bonnell v. Lorenzo</i> , 241 F.3d 800 (6th Cir. 2001).....	13
<i>Champions Golf Club, Inc. v. Champions Golf Club, Inc.</i> , 78 F.3d 1111 (6th Cir. 1996).....	19
<i>Citibank, N.A. v. Citytrust</i> , 756 F.2d 273 (2d Cir. 1985).....	27
<i>Falcon Stainless, Inc. v. Rino Cos.</i> , 572 Fed. Appx. 483 (9th Cir. Cal. 2014).....	21
<i>Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.</i> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991)	22
<i>Guar. Residential Lending, Inc. v. Homestead Mortg. Co., L.L.C.</i> , No. 04-74842, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43640 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 13, 2005).....	27
<i>Gucci Am., Inc. v. Guess?, Inc.</i> , 868 F. Supp. 2d 207 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....	18
<i>Hensley Mfg. v. ProPride, Inc.</i> , 579 F.3d 603 (6th Cir. 2009).....	15
<i>Homeowners Grp., Inc. v. Home Mktg. Specialists</i> , 931 F.2d 1100 (6th Cir. 1991).....	19
<i>Huron Mt. Club v. United States Army Corps of Eng'rs</i> , 545 F. App'x 390 (6th Cir. 2013).....	27
<i>Interactive Prods. Corp. v. a2z Mobile Office Sols., Inc.</i> , 326 F.3d 687 (6th Cir. 2003).....	15
<i>J. Thomas Distribs., Inc. v. Greenline Distribs., Inc.</i> , No. 95-2100, 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 29035 (6th Cir. Oct. 31, 1996).....	25
<i>Leary v. Daeschner</i> , 228 F.3d 729 (6th Cir. 2000).....	13
<i>Meshwerks, Inc. v. Toyota Motor Sales U.S.A.</i> , 528 F.3d 1258 (10th Cir. 2008).....	25
<i>Milo & Gabby LLC v. Amazon</i> , No. 2016-1290, 2017 U.S. App. LEXIS 8932 (Fed. Cir. May 23, 2017)	6

<i>NACCO Indus. v. Applicia, Inc.</i> , No. 1:06-cv-3002, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 91940 (N.D. Ohio Dec. 20, 2006).....	27
<i>New Kids on the Block v. News Am. Publ'g, Inc.</i> , 971 F.2d 302 (9th Cir. 1992).....	15, 16
<i>Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 1962 (2014)	27
<i>Playboy Enters. v. Universal Tel-A-Talk</i> , No. 96-CV-6961, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8231 (E.D. Pa. June 1, 1998)	19
<i>Projector-Recorder Belt Corp. v. Consol. Elecs., Inc.</i> , No. 91-4102, 1992 U.S. App. LEXIS 18399 (6th Cir. July 24, 1992).....	23
<i>R&B, Inc. v. Needa Parts Mfg.</i> , 50 F. App'x 519 (3d Cir. 2002)	21, 26
<i>Ross, Brovins & Oehmke, P.C. v. Lexis Nexis Grp.</i> , 463 F.3d 478 (6th Cir. 2006).....	23
<i>Schoolhouse Inc. v. Anderson</i> , 275 F.3d 726 (8th Cir. 2002).....	23
<i>Southco, Inc. v. Kanebridge Corp.</i> , 390 F.3d 276 (3d Cir. 2004).....	26
<i>Tenneco Auto. Operating Co. v. Kingdom Auto Parts</i> , 410 F. App'x 841 (6th Cir. 2010).....	20, 21
<i>Tumblebus Inc. v. Cranmer</i> , 399 F.3d 754 (6th Cir. 2005).....	13
<i>Vireo Sys. v. HTG Ventures, LLC</i> , No. 3:14-cv-2359, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 54752 (M.D. Tenn. Apr. 27, 2015).....	13
<i>Weyerhaeuser NR Co. v. La.-Pac. Corp.</i> , No. 3:13-00805, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135739 (M.D. Tenn. Sep. 23, 2013)	12, 29
<i>Wilden Pump & Eng'g LLC v. JDA Glob. LLC</i> , No. CV 12-1051 ODW (DTBx), 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 155599 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2012) .	21
<i>Winter v. NRDC, Inc.</i> , 555 U.S. 7 (2008)	12
Statutes	
15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(b).....	19
17 U.S.C. § 101	22
17 U.S.C. § 103.....	22
Other Authorities	
1 Nimmer on Copyright § 3.03	24
Senate-House Joint Explanatory Statement on Trademark Counterfeiting Legislation, 130 Cong.	

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.