

Carl D. Crowell, OSB No. 982049  
email: carl@crowell-law.com  
Drew P. Taylor, OSB No. 135974  
email: drew@crowell-law.com  
CROWELL LAW  
P.O. Box 923  
Salem, OR 97308  
(503) 581-1240  
Of attorneys for plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

Case No.: 3:15-cv-01828

**VOLTAGE PICTURES, LLC, and  
TCYK, LLC,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**DOE-24.21.175.89,**

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

STATE TRADEMARK

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Voltage Pictures, LLC, and TCYK, LLC, complain and allege as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is a suit for copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq. (“The Copyright Act”) and for a violation of ORS 647.105, Oregon’s State Trademark Law.
2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
3. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

4. Venue in this district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a) as the defendant is believed to reside in this district.

PARTIES

PLAINTIFFS

5. Plaintiff Voltage Pictures, LLC (“Voltage”) is a limited liability company with principal offices in Los Angeles, California that produces, markets and distributes motion pictures including a motion picture titled *The Company You Keep* (“motion picture”), the subject work in this lawsuit.

6. Plaintiff TKYC, LLC is a limited liability company with principal offices in Los Angeles, California and the registered copyright holder for the motion picture, *The Company You Keep*, the subject work in this lawsuit.

The Rights of TCYK, LLC

7. The motion picture in this case, titled *The Company You Keep*, has been registered with the United States Copyright Office by the owner, TCYK, LLC, Registration No. PAu 3-660-935, 2012.

8. Under The Copyright Act, TCYK, LLC is the proprietor of all copyrights, title, and related interest in the motion picture.

9. The motion picture contains wholly original material that is copyrightable subject matter under the laws of the United States.

10. The motion picture is currently offered for sale in commerce.

11. The motion picture is easily discernible as a professional work as it was created using professional performers, directors, cinematographers, lighting technicians, set designers and editors and with professional-grade cameras, lighting and editing equipment.

12. Defendant had notice of plaintiff's rights through general publication and advertising and more specifically as identified in the content of the motion picture, advertising associated with the motion picture, and all packaging and copies, each of which bore a proper copyright notice.

#### Rights of Voltage

13. Voltage has sole and exclusive rights to use the mark VOLTAGE PICTURES in association with its goods and services both within the State of Oregon and nationwide.

14. Voltage marks its works with the trademark VOLTAGE PICTURES to distinguish its products from others and to identify it as the source of its products.

15. In the marketing of *The Company You Keep*, Voltage has branded the motion picture with plaintiff's famous, distinctive and registered trademark, VOLTAGE PICTURES.

16. The mark VOLTAGE PICTURES has been registered with the State of Oregon pursuant to ORS 647.015, Registry Number 42677.

#### THE DEFENDANT

17. The defendant identified herein as DOE-24.21.175.89, is currently known only by their Internet Protocol ("IP") Address 24.21.175.89, which on 08/27/2015 at 01:03:33 AM UTC, and at other times, was observed by plaintiff's investigators, Maverickeye, as infringing the motion picture.

18. Through geolocation, the IP address used by the defendant has subsequently been traced to the State of Oregon.

19. The defendant's IP address has been observed and confirmed as distributing plaintiff's motion picture multiple times.

20. Defendant's IP address has been observed as associated with the peer-to-peer exchange of a large number of copyrighted titles through the BitTorrent network.

21. Prior to filing suit, Rightscorp, Inc. sent over 50 notices of infringing activity to the defendant's IP address, yet significant infringing activity continues to be observed associated with defendant's IP address even up to the filing of this complaint.

22. The volume and titles of the activity associated with defendant's IP address indicates that the defendant is likely the primary subscriber of the IP address or someone who resides with the subscriber, as such activity indicates the defendant is an authorized user of the IP address with consistent and permissive access which has continued even after multiple express notice by Rightscorp, Inc.

23. The volume and titles of the activity associated with defendant's IP address indicates that the defendant is not a young child.

24. At that time of observed infringement defendant's IP address was managed by Internet Service Provider ("ISP") Comcast, who on information and belief, generally assigns an IP address to a single party for extended periods of time and provides Wi-Fi systems with notable pre-installed security and passwords.

25. The records maintained by Comcast should be able to identify either the defendant, or the subscriber who contracted with Comcast for service who in turn is likely to have knowledge that will lead to the identity of the defendant.

26. Plaintiff intends to seek initial discovery to subpoena records from Comcast to ascertain the true identity of the defendant.

### BACKGROUND

#### PEER-TO-PEER INTERNET PIRACY

27. As stated by Congressman Lamar Smith, "Illegal counterfeiting and piracy costs the U.S. economy \$100 billion and thousands of jobs every year."

28. As noted by Senator Levin in Congressional hearings on peer-to-peer Internet piracy, “In the world of copyright law, taking someone’s intellectual property is a serious offense, punishable by large fines. In the real world, violations of copyright law over the Internet are so widespread and easy to accomplish that many participants seem to consider it equivalent to jaywalking – illegal but no big deal. But it is a big deal. Under U.S. law, stealing intellectual property is just that – stealing. It hurts artists, the music industry, the movie industry, and others involved in creative work. And it is unfortunate that the software being used – called ‘file sharing’ as if it were simply enabling friends to share recipes, is helping create a generation of Americans who don’t see the harm.”

29. In 2013, in recognition of the growing problems and challenges with counterfeiting and piracy, The Oregon House of Representatives passed House Memorial 2, which made the following findings:

Whereas the United States and other nations share the challenge of combating intellectual piracy and the counterfeiting of intellectual property such as ... films... and technologies that affect the quality of life; and

Whereas intellectual piracy and counterfeiting have a significant impact on Oregon's economy, and the economies of other states and of nations around the world, which results in job and earnings losses, reduced tax revenues and increased threats to public health and safety; and

...

Whereas protecting and enforcing intellectual property rights is crucial to the future of our innovation-based economy; and

Whereas industries that use intellectual property extensively generate nearly \$7.7 trillion in gross output and account for more than 60 percent of total exports from our nation; and

Whereas industries that use intellectual property extensively ... employ more than 19 million Americans, whose salaries average about 60 percent higher than salaries in industries that do not make extensive use of intellectual property; and

Whereas intellectual property infringement can undermine the nation's economic security; and

Whereas violations of intellectual property rights, ambiguities in the law and a lack of enforcement create uncertainty in the marketplace and in the legal system and undermine consumer trust; and

Whereas intellectual property, including trademarks, [are] essential ...; and

...

Whereas failing to adequately protect and enforce intellectual property rights will increase counterfeiting and illicit trade;

...

30. As such it is clear that giving effect to 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq., and the enforcement of intellectual property rights, and in particular the fight against counterfeiting and piracy are critical issues of importance to the both the United States of America and the State of Oregon.

31. Internet piracy, and in particular BitTorrent piracy, though known as peer-to-peer file sharing, is often a for-profit business generating hundreds of millions annually in illegal revenue off of stolen content through sales and advertising while costing our economy billions more.

32. Many for-profit businesses incorporate counterfeits of plaintiff's marketing materials, including trailers, posters, and other media and content to promote the use of their torrent sites and the unauthorized download and distribution of plaintiff's motion picture.

33. To increase the value of the advertising and sometimes subscription access sold by torrent sites, many parties work to expand the pool of available titles and speed of downloads available by increasing the number of member peers and thus the desirability of their clients and networks. To accomplish this they often reward participants who contribute by giving them faster download speeds, greater access, or other benefits.

34. Defendant's participation in the BitTorrent exchange of plaintiff's motion picture is the type of activity that torrent sites use to promote their business and likely directly furthered the for-profit business of at least one torrent site.

35. Many parties, and possibly defendant, have been compensated with increased access to other content, faster download speeds, or other forms of compensation for their participation in expanding the availability of pirated content, including plaintiff's movie.

36. The use of BitTorrent does more than cause harm through the simple theft of intellectual property. The BitTorrent distribution of pirated files is a model of business that profits from

theft through sales and advertising and provides a system of rewards and compensation to the participants, each of whom contribute to and furthers enterprise that steals hundreds of millions of dollars from our economy and costs our economy billions more.

37. Based on activity observed associated with defendant's IP address, defendant is a prolific proponent and supporter of the BitTorrent distribution system advancing the BitTorrent economy of piracy.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

38. Defendant, without the permission or consent of plaintiff, copied and distributed plaintiff's motion picture through a public BitTorrent network.

39. Defendant's actions infringed plaintiff's exclusive rights under The Copyright Act.

40. Defendant's conduct has been willful, intentional, in disregard of and indifferent to plaintiff's rights with the intent to deprive plaintiff of income and cause plaintiff harm.

41. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's conduct, plaintiff's exclusive rights under 17 U.S.C. § 106 have been violated.

42. Plaintiff is entitled to damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504 and attorney fees and costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.

43. The conduct of defendant is causing, and unless enjoined and restrained by this Court, will continue to cause plaintiff great and irreparable injury.

44. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §§ 502 and 503, plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting defendant from further contributing to the infringement of plaintiff copyrights and ordering that defendant destroy all copies of the motion picture made in violation of plaintiff's rights.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

ORS 647.105 – STATE TRADEMARK

45. Pursuant to ORS 647.095, a person who without the consent of Voltage uses the VOLTAGE PICTURES mark in connection with the distribution of a reproduction or counterfeit of a motion picture is liable for the equitable remedies provided in ORS 647.105.

46. Pursuant to ORS 647.105, “The owner of a mark registered under this chapter may proceed in a civil action to seek an injunction against the ... use, display or sale of a counterfeit or imitation of the mark.”

47. Voltage comes to this court seeking the equitable remedies provided by ORS Chapter 647, namely an injunction against those who would, without authorization, use, reproduce and distribute motion pictures which bear its registered trademark.

48. Defendant, without the authorization or consent of Voltage, used and distributed a reproduction or counterfeit of a motion picture bearing Voltage’s registered trademark VOLTAGE PICTURES.

49. Defendant, without the authorization or consent of Voltage, supported and furthered the BitTorrent economy of piracy which regularly uses and infringes on the VOLTAGE PICTURES mark.

50. Defendant has acted with knowledge and in bad faith in their infringement of Voltage’s rights.

51. Voltage is entitled to an order of from this court enjoining defendant from infringing its rights and directing defendant to delete all unauthorized copies of Voltage’s motion pictures.

DAMAGES

52. Plaintiff TCYK, LLC has been damaged and claims statutory damages from the infringer pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2) in an amount to be determined by the court.



53. Plaintiffs each have been damaged and claim equitable relief.

54. Plaintiffs give notice they may move to elect the full scope of relief available against defendant and others as discovery proceeds.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray for judgment against defendant as follows:

- A. For entry of permanent injunction enjoining defendant from directly, indirectly or contributory infringing plaintiffs' rights, including without limitation by using the internet to reproduce or copy plaintiffs' motion pictures, to distribute plaintiffs' motion pictures, or to make plaintiffs' motion pictures available for distribution to the public, except pursuant to a lawful license or with the express authority of plaintiffs. And further directing defendant to destroy all unauthorized copies of plaintiffs' motion pictures;
- B. For entry of permanent injunction enjoining defendant from using the Internet for the unlicensed download and distribution of copyrighted content;
- C. Statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504 in an amount deemed just and proper by the Court;
- D. For plaintiffs' reasonable costs and attorney fees; and
- E. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

///

///

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

DATED: September 26, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

CROWELL LAW

*/s/ Carl D. Crowell*

Carl D. Crowell, OSB No. 982049

carl@crowell-law.com

Drew P. Taylor, OSB No. 135974

drew@crowell-law.com

503-581-1240

Of attorneys for plaintiffs