

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 8, 2021

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 20-50674

CAT AND DOGMA, LLC,

Plaintiff—Appellant,

versus

TARGET CORPORATION,

Defendant—Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 1:19-CV-1002

Before WIENER, ELROD, and HIGGINSON, *Circuit Judges.*

PER CURIAM:*

A Texas-based children's clothing company, Cat and Dogma, sued Target Corporation for copyright infringement. The district court granted Target Corporation's motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). We REVERSE the judgment of the district court and REMAND the case for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIRCUIT RULE 47.5.4.

No. 20-50674

I.

Cat and Dogma (“Dogma”) is an Austin-based children’s clothing company. In 2015, Dogma published a two-dimensional design of a children’s pajama garment (“The Design”). The Design consists of the phrase “i love you” displayed in a cursive, italicized font and all lowercase typeface. The phrase is arranged in 25 rows of repeating text. The phrase repeats 3–5 times in each of The Design’s 25 horizontal rows. Dogma registered The Design with the United States Copyright Office and was granted Copyright Registration Number VA 2-172-249, with the effective date of September 19, 2019.

In 2017, Target Corporation (“Target”) began selling a line of children’s garments, sheets, and blankets that also incorporated the phrase “i love you,” written in a cursive, italicized font and all-lowercase typeface. Target’s garments also display the phrase in rows of repeating text.

In October 2019, Dogma filed a lawsuit against Target for copyright infringement, alleging that Target infringed its copyright in The Design by reproducing, distributing, and publicly displaying The Design without Dogma’s authorization. In response, Target filed a motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Target argued that Dogma’s Design was not copyrightable and alleged a lack of substantial similarity between The Design and Target’s products. The district court granted Target’s motion to dismiss. Dogma timely appealed.

II.

“We review motions to dismiss *de novo*.” *Franklin v. Regions Bank*, 976 F.3d 443, 447 (5th Cir. 2020). We may not look beyond the pleadings when considering a 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1341 (5th Cir. 1994). We accept all factual allegations as true and view the facts in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Jebaco, Inc. v. Harrah’s*

No. 20-50674

Operating Co., Inc., 587 F.3d 314, 318 (5th Cir. 2009) (“Viewing the facts as pled in the light most favorable to the nonmovant, a motion to dismiss . . . should not be granted if a complaint provides ‘enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’”) (quoting *Doe v. MySpace, Inc.*, 528 F.3d 413, 418 (5th Cir. 2008)).

“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. 544, 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 plaintiff must therefore allege sufficient factual matter for each required element of the cause of action. *Id.*; *Allen v. Walmart Stores, L.L.C.*, 907 F.3d 170, 178 (5th Cir. 2018) (citing *Rios v. City of Del Rio*, 444 F.3d 417, 421 (5th Cir. 2006)).

III.

“To prove copyright infringement, a plaintiff must establish (1) ownership of a valid copyright; (2) factual copying; and (3) substantial similarity.” *Nola Spice Designs, L.L.C. v. Haydel Enters., Inc.*, 783 F.3d 527, 549 (5th Cir. 2015) (quoting *Armour v. Knowles*, 512 F.3d 147, 152 (5th Cir. 2007) (per curiam)).

A.

The first element of a copyright infringement claim is ownership of a valid copyright. “Copyright ownership is shown by proof of originality and copyrightability in the work as a whole and by compliance with applicable statutory formalities.” *Eng’g Dynamics, Inc. v. Structural Software, Inc.*, 26 F.3d 1335, 1340 (5th Cir. 1994) (citing *Plains Cotton Coop. Ass’n v. Goodpasture Comput. Serv., Inc.*, 807 F.2d 1256, 1260 (5th Cir. 1987)). This

No. 20-50674

includes copyright registration. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 410(c). “A certificate of registration, if timely obtained, is prima facie evidence both that a copyright is valid and that the registrant owns the copyright.” *Gen. Universal Sys., Inc. v. Lee*, 379 F.3d 131, 141 (5th Cir. 2004) (per curiam). The defendant may rebut this presumption by offering evidence to dispute the plaintiff’s prima facie case of infringement. *Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Seattle Lighting Fixture Co.*, 345 F.3d 1140, 1144 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing *Entm’t Rsch. Grp., Inc. v. Genesis Creative Grp., Inc.*, 122 F.3d 1211, 1217 (9th Cir. 1997)); *see also Norma Ribbon & Trimming, Inc. v. Little*, 51 F.3d 45, 47 (5th Cir. 1995) (discussing evidence brought by the defendant to dispute the copyright’s presumptive originality on a motion for summary judgment).

Here, Dogma alleges its ownership of Copyright Registration VA 2-172-249 for The Design. We must accept all of Dogma’s factual allegations as true and view such facts in the light most favorable to Dogma. *Jebaco, Inc.*, 587 F.3d at 318. Accordingly, we hold that Dogma adequately alleges ownership of a valid, registered copyright at the pleading stage.

Target attempts to rebut the presumptive validity afforded by Dogma’s registration and asks us to affirm the district court’s decision that Dogma’s design is not copyrightable because it lacks the minimum level of creativity to be sufficiently original. *Cat & Dogma v. Target Corp.*, No. 19-1002, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 152762 at *5-6 (W.D. Tex. July 23, 2020). However, these arguments are premature. Reaching this issue would require us to look beyond the pleadings to make a factual determination and is thus inappropriate on a motion to dismiss. *Cinel*, 15 F.3d at 1341 (stating “[w]e may not look beyond the pleadings” on a 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss). Accordingly, we do not decide whether Target has successfully rebutted the presumption of validity.

No. 20-50674

B.

The second element of a copyright infringement claim is factual copying. In its Amended Complaint, Dogma alleges that Target had access to The Design before Target began selling the allegedly infringing pajama garments. Target does not dispute this allegation. We will therefore assume that Dogma adequately alleges factual copying. See *Audler v. CBC Innovis Inc.*, 519 F.3d 239, 255 (5th Cir. 2008) (“A party ‘waives an issue if he fails to adequately brief it.’”) (quoting *Castro v. McCord*, 256 F. App’x 664, 665 (5th Cir. 2007)).

C.

The third element of a copyright infringement claim is substantial similarity. To assess substantial similarity, “a side-by-side comparison must be made between the original and the copy to determine whether a layman would view the two works as substantially similar.” *Nola Spice*, 783 F.3d at 550 (quoting *Creations Unlimited, Inc. v. McCain*, 112 F.3d 814, 816 (5th Cir. 1997)) (cleaned up). However, where the original work contains unprotectable elements, courts must first “distinguish between protectable and unprotectable elements of the copyrighted work,” filtering out any unprotectable elements. *Id.* at 550. The court then determines whether the allegedly infringing work is substantially similar to the protectable aspects of the original work. *Id.* (citing *Peel & Co. v. Rug Mkt.*, 238 F.3d 391, 398 (5th Cir. 2001)). We address in turn: (1) whether Dogma has alleged the existence of a protectable design element, and (2) whether Dogma has alleged substantial similarity between Target’s products and the protectable element of The Design.

1.

In the first step of the *Nola Spice* filtration analysis, we consider whether Dogma has alleged the existence of a protectable element in The

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.