

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

AMY LEE SULLIVAN d/b/a DESIGN KIT,

Plaintiff,

v.

FLORA, INC.,

Defendant.

OPINION AND ORDER

15-cv-298-wmc

---

In her amended complaint, Amy Sullivan alleges that defendant Flora, Inc. violated 17 U.S.C. § 101 by improperly using plaintiff's copyrighted materials. Before this court is defendant's Rule 12(b)(7) motion to dismiss plaintiff's amended complaint for failure to join Designomotion, Inc., and Eva Kao, who were named as defendants in plaintiff's original complaint but then were voluntarily dismissed without prejudice by plaintiff's unilateral filing of Rule 41(a)(1) notices. (Dkt. #18.) The remaining defendant, Flora, contends that because plaintiff created the materials in dispute jointly with these two other parties, those parties are required to determine actual ownership of the materials. Flora further contends that ownership of these materials must be resolved before this court decides any infringement claim. For the reasons set forth below, the court finds that Rule 19(a) does not require joinder of these two parties. Therefore, it will deny defendant's motion to dismiss for failure to join a required party.

Also before the court is plaintiff's motion for leave to file a second amended complaint, adding an unjust enrichment claim (dkt. #26), which the court will grant for the reasons provided at the end of this opinion.

## BACKGROUND

On February 15, 2013, Sullivan entered into an agreement with Designomotion, Inc., to produce artwork for two videos, entitled “Flora 7-Sources” and “Flor-Essence.” These videos were for Designomotion’s client, Flora, Inc. Eva Kao, a Designomotion employee, helped develop the videos. Sullivan completed the artwork for both videos by May 31, 2013.

On October 15, 2013, Sullivan discovered that Flora had reused her artwork from these two videos in new promotional advertising. Sullivan contacted Flora the next day about this usage. Some of the images were subsequently removed by October 17.

On November 6, 2013, Sullivan obtained a copyright for the illustrations she provided for the “Flora 7-Sources” video. On December 12, 2013, she also obtained a separate copyright for the illustrations she provided for the “Flor-Essence” video.

On the same date, December 12, 2013, Sullivan again contacted Flora about unauthorized use of her work, and she proposed a licensing agreement for continued use of her illustrations. Flora declined. Since obtaining her copyrights, Sullivan alleges that Flora (1) has reused her protected artwork on several occasions and (2) continues to do so, all without her consent.

On May 20, 2015, Amy Sullivan filed her original complaint against three defendants: Flora, Inc., Designomotion, Inc., and Eva Kao. This complaint claimed damages for federal copyright infringement, contributory copyright infringement, breach of license agreement, breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing, trade dress infringement, and false designation of origin under the Lanham Act. (Dkt. #1.) It also

sought declaratory judgment for ownership of the copyrighted material in dispute.

On August 4, 2015, plaintiff voluntarily dismissed both Designomotion, Inc. and Kao from her complaint. In response, Flora both answered the complaint and filed a motion to dismiss for failure to join a necessary or indispensable party under Rule 19. (Dkt. ##15, 18.) While plaintiff later filed an amended complaint, she again listed Flora as the sole remaining defendant. (Dkt. #17.) The amended complaint did, however, only claim damages for federal copyright infringement against Flora, and it also did not include any claim for a declaratory judgment as to the ownership of the materials at issue. In response, Flora renewed her original objection by filing a second motion to dismiss for failure to join a necessary or indispensable party under Rule 19, which remains pending before the court.

## OPINION

### I. Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(7)

Under Rule 19(a)(1), a so-called “required party” is “subject to service of process and whose joinder will not deprive the court of subject-matter jurisdiction must be joined as a party if:”

(A) in that person’s absence, the court cannot accord complete relief among existing parties; or

(B) that person claims an interest relating to the subject of the action and is so situated that disposing of the action in the person’s absence may:

(i) as a practical matter impair or impede the person’s ability to protect the interest; or

(ii) leave an existing party subject to a substantial risk of incurring double, multiple, or otherwise inconsistent obligations because of the interest.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 19(a)(1). If the absentee party is found to be a required party under Rule 19(a)(1), but cannot feasibly be joined in suit, then the court must proceed to Rule 19(b) to determine whether to proceed without the party or dismiss the lawsuit. *Askew v. Sheriff of Cook Cnty., Ill.*, 568 F.3d 632, 634 (7th Cir. 2009). If an action cannot proceed without the required party, then the party is deemed “indispensable” and the proceeding must be dismissed.

Flora argues that Designomotion and Kao are required parties under Rule 19 for two overlapping (if not identical) reasons. *First*, Flora argues that both Designomotion and Kao have claimed an interest in the copyrighted materials and proceeding in their absence would impair their ability to protect that interest. As an initial matter, it is unclear that *either* of the absent parties has claimed an interest in the copyrighted materials. To support its argument, Flora relies heavily on allegations contained in plaintiff’s original complaint, but dropped from her amended complaint, which allege that Designomotion and Kao both improperly claimed an ownership interest in her materials. While it is true that the court may look to extrinsic evidence outside of the amended complaint in deciding a Rule 19 challenge, a since withdrawn allegation of ownership is not enough to establish that either company claimed interest in copyrighted materials. *See Ladenberger v. Nat’l Tech. Transfer, Inc.*, No. 99 C 5348, 2000 WL 1349247, at \*4 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 19, 2000) (noting that courts need more than a mere allegation of ownership to establish a claimed interest). The court is therefore unpersuaded that these

dropped allegations alone justify compulsory joinder under Rule 19.

Nor have Designomotion or Kao sought to intervene in this case. Typically, a party elects to intervene in cases where its interest may be inadequately represented by the current parties. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24. For this reason, courts may factor an absentee's choice *not* to seek to intervene in determining the presence of a claimed interest. *Ladenberger*, 2000 WL 1349247, at \*4. Indeed, the Seventh Circuit prefers for "the absent party [to] claim [the] interest" in compulsory joinder cases. *Davis Cos. v. Emerald Casino, Inc.*, 268 F.3d 477, 483 (7th Cir. 2001). The fact that both Designomotion and Kao have chosen to abstain from the litigation since being dismissed suggests that they have no interest in the materials, or at least not a substantial one. *Id.* ("[U]nder Rule 19(a) it is the absent party that typically must claim such an interest."); *see also States v. Bowen*, 172 F.3d 682, 689 (9th Cir. 1999) (holding that a district court properly found joinder unnecessary where an absent party was aware of litigation but did not personally claim an interest in the matter); *Ladenberger*, 2000 WL 1349247, at \*4 (noting that a court may factor a party's choice not to intervene into Rule 19 analysis).

Finally, Flora points to two letters allegedly showing that Designomotion played a significant role in developing the copyrighted materials, and therefore it possesses an ownership interest in them. (Terpstra Decl., Ex. 1 (dkt. #20-1) 2 ("In fact, the Flor-Essence Video is not your sole work. It was a collaborative multimedia effort authored by Designomotion, the client (Flora), as well as a team of 6 artists hired by Designomotion."); Steger Decl., Ex. A (dkt. #25-1) 2 ("Both projects were collaborative efforts that involved contributions from Mr. Silver, Ms. Sullivan and other artists

# 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.