

Honorable Thomas S. Zilly

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

COBBLER NEVADA, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID MCREYNOLDS, an individual;
MONYRIN OUN, an individual;
ERIC HAZEN, an individual;
RICHARD RIKARD, an individual; and
PEDRO ALONZO, an individual,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 15-cv-1404TSZ

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

Plaintiff Cobbler Nevada, LLC, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 15(a)(1), hereby submits its first amended complaint against Defendants:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff Cobbler Nevada, LLC is a developer and producer of the motion picture *The Cobbler* (“motion picture”). Plaintiff brings this action in an effort to stop Defendants and others from copying and distributing to others unauthorized copies of the Plaintiff’s copyrighted motion picture through the BitTorrent file sharing protocol. Defendants’ infringements allow them and others to unlawfully obtain and distribute unauthorized copyrighted works that the Plaintiff expended significant resources to create. Each time a Defendant unlawfully distributes an

1 unauthorized copy of the Plaintiff's copyrighted motion picture to others over the Internet, each
2 person who copies that motion picture can then distribute that unlawful copy to others without any
3 significant degradation in sound and picture quality. Thus, a Defendant's distribution of even a
4 part of an unlawful copy of a motion picture can further the nearly instantaneous worldwide
5 distribution of that single copy to an unlimited number of people. Further, Defendants acts of
6 distributing Plaintiff's motion picture support, maintain and further a for-profit exploitation of the
7 works of Plaintiff and others. The Plaintiff now seeks redress for this rampant infringement of its
8 exclusive rights.

9 II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10 2. This is a civil action seeking damages and injunctive relief for copyright
11 infringement under the copyright laws of the United States (17 U.S.C. § 101 et seq.).

12 3. This Court has jurisdiction under 17 U.S.C. § 101 et seq.; 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal
13 question); and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) (copyright).

14 4. Venue in this District is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and/or
15 28 U.S.C. §1400(a). Although the true identity of each Defendant is unknown to Plaintiff at this
16 time, on information and belief each Defendant may be found in this District and/or a substantial
17 part of the acts of infringement complained of herein occurred in this District. On information and
18 belief, personal jurisdiction in this District is proper because each Defendant, without consent or
19 permission of Plaintiff as exclusive rights owner, distributed and offered to distribute over the
20 Internet copyrighted works for which Plaintiff has exclusive rights.

21 III. PARTIES

22 A. PLAINTIFF COBBLER NEVADA, LLC AND ITS COPYRIGHT

23 5. Plaintiff is a limited liability company. Plaintiff is engaged in the production of the
24 motion picture known as and entitled "*The Cobbler*" for theatrical exhibition, home entertainment
25 and other forms of distribution.
26

1 6. Plaintiff is the owner of the exclusive rights under copyright in the United States in
2 *The Cobbler*. *The Cobbler* been registered with the United States Copyright Office by the author,
3 Cobbler Nevada, LLC, effective October 22, 2014, and assigned Registration No. Pau 3-744-688.
4 (Exhibit A)

5 7. Under the Copyright Act, Plaintiff is the proprietor of all right, title, and interest in
6 *The Cobbler*, including the exclusive rights to reproduce and distribute to the public as well as the
7 right to sue for past infringement.

8 8. *The Cobbler* contains wholly original material that is copyrightable subject matter
9 under the laws of the United States. It is easily discernible as a professional work as it was created
10 using professional performers, directors, cinematographers, lighting technicians, set designers and
11 editors and with professional-grade cameras, lighting and editing equipment. It has significant
12 value and has been created, produced and lawfully distributed at considerable expense. *The*
13 *Cobbler* is currently offered for sale in commerce, playing in theaters and available for rental
14 and/or purchase from Amazon, iTunes and Netflix, among others.

15 9. Defendants have notice of Plaintiff's rights through general publication and
16 advertising and more specifically as identified in the content of the motion picture, advertising
17 associated with the motion picture, and all packaging and copies, each of which bore a proper
18 copyright notice.

19 **B. DEFENDANTS**

20 10. On information and belief, each Defendant copied and distributed Plaintiff's
21 copyrighted motion picture *The Cobbler*. When originally filed, the true names of Defendants were
22 unknown to Plaintiff. Rather, each Defendant was known to Plaintiff only by the Internet Protocol
23 ("IP") address assigned by an Internet Service Provider ("ISP") and the date and at the time at
24 which the infringing activity of each Defendant was observed, as explained in detail below. On
25 information and belief, ISP's such as Comcast or CenturyLink, generally assign an IP address to a
26 single party for extended periods of time, often for months or even years. As such it is likely that

1 for all relevant times each Defendant was the sole party responsible for and in control of IP address.
2 As explained in further detail below, through geolocation, the IP address used by each Defendant
3 was traced to the Western District of Washington. The IP addresses, hash value, dates and times,
4 ISP and geolocation contained in Exhibit B correctly reflect the subscribers using the IP addresses
5 and that they were all part of a “swarm” of users that were reproducing, distributing, displaying or
6 performing the copyrighted work

7 11. The Court authorized Plaintiff to conduct expedited discovery with the ISP that
8 assigned the IP addresses to each Defendant in this case. Plaintiff promptly served the subpoena
9 on the ISP. The ISP subsequently responded to the subpoena providing the identity of each
10 Defendant, where available.

11 12. After receipt of the identity of each Defendant, Plaintiff engaged in further due
12 diligence in a good faith effort to confirm, on information and belief, that the identified subscriber
13 was the person responsible for the infringing conduct or, in the alternative, that another party with
14 access to the IP address of the subscriber was responsible. For example, each IP address has been
15 observed associated with significant BitTorrent activity and with the exchange of multiple other
16 titles on peer-to-peer networks apart from but in some instances close in time to that of *The*
17 *Cobbler*. The volume, titles and persistent observed BitTorrent activity associated with each
18 Defendant’s IP address indicate (a) that each Defendant is not a transitory or occasional guest, but
19 either the primary subscriber of the IP address or someone who resides with the subscriber and is
20 an authorized user of the IP address; (b) that any user of the IP address would likely have been
21 aware of the bandwidth devoted to this activity through general service slowdown throughout the
22 observed period of activity as residential data services typically have limited capacity; (c) that such
23 subscriber or resident of the location is likely to have been aware of at least some of the infringing
24 activity throughout the observed period of activity; and/or (d) that each Defendant is not a child,
25 but an adult, often with mature distinct tastes.
26

1 13. In certain instances, the pattern of BitTorrent activity associated with the IP address
2 was observed to cease on or near dates coinciding with notices sent by the ISP or Plaintiff,
3 providing a further indication that the subscriber either was the infringer or was aware of the
4 ongoing infringement utilizing the IP address assigned to the subscriber, and was in a position to
5 control ongoing BitTorrent activity.

6 14. Google address mapping and county records were investigated to confirm
7 ownership/rental status of and residence at the property associated with the IP address, as well as
8 observe the physical makeup and layout of the house and neighborhood to anticipate possible
9 claims that a wireless signal was hijacked by someone outside of the residence. Further, given
10 the standard security measures imposed by the ISP to prevent unauthorized use of an IP address,
11 the volume of piracy demonstrated over the extended observation period could not be the result of
12 someone driving by, a temporary houseguest or a hacker sitting in a car on the street

13 15. In some instances, social media sites such as Facebook and LinkedIn were used to
14 obtain further information on the subscriber.

15 16. Finally, in an exercise of caution, multiple letters were sent to the identified
16 individual, or their counsel to the extent Plaintiff was made aware thereof, informally requesting
17 their voluntary participation in identifying the actual infringer, to the extent that is different from
18 the subscriber. Where responses were received, Plaintiff attempted further informal follow-up with
19 the subscriber or their attorney, again in an effort to ensure, as much as possible short of formal
20 litigation proceedings, that each Doe Defendant was properly named.

21 17. Based on the investigation to date, and on information and belief, Plaintiff identifies
22 the Does remaining in this case on information and belief as follows:

23 18. The ISP assigned the IP address 73.11.202.89 to a subscriber that confirmed that
24 the IP address was shared during the relevant time with Doe 2, Defendant David McReynolds,
25 9011 Old Highway 99 SE, Trlr. #129, Olympia, WA 98501, believed at the time to be a tenant or
26 roommate. On information and belief, Defendant resides at the noted location.

1 19. ISP Comcast assigned the IP address 76.104.235.145 to Doe 3, Defendant Monyrin
2 Oun, 1828 Harper St., Tacoma, WA 98404, for a period of time, including but not limited to on
3 3/20/15 03:57:50 AM UTC, and Defendant's IP address was observed infringing Plaintiff's motion
4 picture at that time. On information and belief, Defendant resides at the noted location.

5 20. ISP Comcast assigned the IP address 73.37.93.187 to Doe 4, Defendant Eric Hazen,
6 1152 17th Ave, Apt. 2, Longview, WA 98632, for a period of time, including but not limited to on
7 3/19/15 04:05:26 AM UTC, and Defendant's IP address was observed infringing Plaintiff's motion
8 picture at that time. On information and belief, Defendant resides at the noted location.

9 21. ISP Comcast assigned the IP address 98.246.186.71 to Doe 5, Defendant Richard
10 Rikard, 2817 Ocean Beach Hwy, Longview, WA 98632, for a period of time, including but not
11 limited to on 3/16/15 09:19:31 PM UTC, and Defendant's IP address was observed infringing
12 Plaintiff's motion picture at that time. On information and belief, Defendant resides at the noted
13 location.

14 22. The ISP assigned the IP address 24.16.69.238 to a subscriber that confirmed that
15 the IP address was shared during the relevant time with Doe 9, Defendant Pedro Alonzo, 3469 S.
16 152nd St., Apt. 111, Tukwila, WA 98188, believed at the time to be a tenant or roommate. On
17 information and belief, Defendant resides at the noted location.

18 **IV. PEER-TO-PEER NETWORKS AND THE BITTORRENT PROTOCOL**

19 23. Defendants are each participants in a peer-to-peer ("P2P") network using the
20 BitTorrent protocol. The BitTorrent protocol makes even small computers with low bandwidth
21 capable of participating in large data transfers across a P2P network. To begin an exchange, the
22 initial file-provider intentionally elects to share a file with a torrent network. This initial file is
23 called a seed. Other users ("peers") connect to the network and connect to the seed file to
24 download. As yet additional peers request the same file each additional user becomes a part of the
25 network from where the file can be downloaded. However, unlike a traditional peer-to-peer
26 network, each new file downloader is receiving a different piece of the data from users who have

1 already downloaded the file that together comprises the whole. This piecemeal system with
2 multiple pieces of data coming from peer members is usually referred to as a “swarm.” The effect
3 of this technology makes every downloader also an uploader of the illegally transferred file(s).
4 This means that every “node” or peer user who has a copy of the infringing copyrighted material
5 on a torrent network can also be a source of download, and thus distributor for that infringing file.

6 24. This distributed nature of BitTorrent leads to a rapid viral spreading of a file
7 throughout peer users. As more peers join the swarm, the likelihood of a successful download
8 increases. Essentially, because of the nature of the swarm downloads as described above, every
9 infringer is sharing copyrighted material with other infringers.

10 25. Defendants actions are part of a common design, intention and purpose to hide
11 behind the apparent anonymity provided by the Internet and the BitTorrent technology to
12 download pieces of the copyrighted motion picture in a manner that, but for the investigative
13 technology used by Plaintiff, would be untraceable, leaving the Plaintiff without the ability to
14 enforce its copyright rights. By participating in the “swarm” to download Plaintiff’s copyright
15 motion picture, the Defendants agreed with one another to use the Internet and BitTorrent
16 technology to engage in violation of federal statute to accomplish and unlawful objective.

17 **V. COMPUTER FORENSIC IDENTIFICATION OF BITTORRENT INFRINGEMENT**

18 26. Plaintiff has identified each Defendant by the IP address assigned by the ISP used
19 by each Defendant and the date and at the time at which the infringing activity of each Defendant
20 was observed. This is accomplished using forensic software to collect, identify and record the IP
21 addresses in use by those people that employ the BitTorrent protocol to share, copy, reproduce and
22 distribute copyrighted works.

23 27. More specifically, forensic software is used to scan peer-to-peer networks for the
24 presence of infringing transactions with respect to a particular audiovisual work. Any digital copy
25 of an audiovisual work may be uniquely identified by a unique, coded, string of characters called
26 a “hash checksum.” The hash checksum is a string of alphanumeric characters generated by a

1 mathematical algorithm known as US Secure Hash Algorithm 1 or “SHA-1.” This software
2 facilitates the identification of computers that are used to transmit a copy or a part of a copy of a
3 digital media file identified by a particular hash value by their IP address at a particular date and
4 time. To overcome concerns with spoofing or the like, a direct TCP connection is made to each
5 defendant’s computer. Additional software using geolocation functionality is then used to confirm
6 the geographical location of the computer used in the infringement. Though an IP address alone
7 does not reveal the name or contact information of the account holder, in this case the Doe
8 Defendant, it does reveal the likely general location of the Defendant. IP addresses are distributed
9 to ISPs by public, nonprofit organizations called Regional Internet Registries. These registries
10 assign blocks of IP addresses to ISPs by geographic region. In the United States, these blocks are
11 assigned and tracked by the American Registry of Internet Numbers. Master tables correlating the
12 IP addresses with local regions are maintained by these organizations in a publicly available and
13 searchable format. An IP address’ geographic location can be further narrowed by cross-
14 referencing this information with secondary sources such as data contributed to commercial
15 databases by ISPs.

16 28. The end result are evidence logs of infringing transactions and the IP addresses of
17 the users responsible for copying and distributing the audiovisual work, here *The Cobbler*. The IP
18 addresses, hash value, dates and times, ISP and geolocation obtained correctly reflect the
19 subscribers using the IP addresses and that they were all part of a “swarm” of users that were
20 reproducing, distributing, displaying or performing the copyrighted work.¹ As noted above,

21
22
23 ¹ In logs kept in the ordinary course of business, ISPs keep track of the IP addresses assigned to their
24 subscribers. Once provided with an IP address, plus the date and time of the detected and documented infringing
25 activity, ISPs can use their subscriber logs to identify the subscriber with more specificity. Only the ISP to whom a
26 particular IP address has been assigned for use by its subscribers can correlate that IP address to a particular subscriber.
From time to time, a subscriber of Internet services may be assigned different IP addresses from their ISP. Thus, to
correlate a subscriber with an IP address, the ISP also needs to know when the IP address was being used.
Unfortunately, many ISPs only retain for a very limited amount of time the information necessary to correlate an IP
address to a particular subscriber, making early discovery important.

1 through early discovery authorized by the Court, Plaintiff was able to identify the Does associated
2 with the IP addresses observed infringing *The Cobbler* in this case.

3 VI. JOINDER

4 29. Each Defendant is alleged to have committed violations of 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et. seq.*
5 within the same series of transactions or occurrences (e.g. downloading and distribution of the
6 same copyrighted motion picture owned by Plaintiff) and by using the same means (BitTorrent
7 network). The infringed work was included in one file related to the torrent file; in other words,
8 all of the infringements alleged in this lawsuit arise from the exact same unique copy of Plaintiff's
9 movie as evidenced by the cryptographic hash value. The Defendants are all part of the exact same
10 "swarm." Defendants' acts occurred in the same series of transactions because each Defendant
11 downloaded and/or distributed, or offered to distribute *The Cobbler* to other infringers on the
12 network, including the Doe Defendants and/or other network users, who in turn downloaded and/or
13 distributed the motion picture. The temporal proximity of the observed acts of each Defendant,
14 together with the known propensity of BitTorrent participants to actively exchange files
15 continuously for hours and even days, makes it possible that Defendants either directly exchanged
16 the motion picture with each other, or did so through intermediaries and each shared in the
17 distribution of the motion picture to others. Therefore, Defendants each conspired with other
18 infringers on the BitTorrent network to copy and/or distribute *The Cobbler*, either in the same
19 transaction or occurrence or a series of transactions or occurrences.

20 30. To use BitTorrent, a user intentionally downloads a program that they then install
21 on their computer called a "client." The BitTorrent client is the user's interface during the
22 downloading/uploading process. The client may be free, supported by advertising, offer upgrades
23 or add on services for a fee, or a combination of several options. Users then intentionally visit a
24 "torrent site" or network site to find media or content available for download, often using a
25 standard web browser. A torrent site is often advertising revenue or subscription supported index
26 of media or content being made available by other users on the network and maintains a listing of

1 movies and television programs among other protected content. A user then uses the torrent site to
2 connect with other users and exchange or “share” content though the BitTorrent protocol often
3 with many users at the same time.

4 31. Internet piracy, and in particular BitTorrent piracy, though known as peer-to-peer
5 file sharing, is often a for-profit business as many software clients, torrent sites and networks
6 generate millions of dollars in revenue through sales and advertising. To increase the value of the
7 advertising and sometimes subscription access sold by torrent sites, many torrent sites work to
8 expand the pool of available titles and speed of downloads through increasing the number of
9 member peers and thus the desirability of their clients and networks. To accomplish this they
10 reward participants who contribute by giving them faster download speeds, greater access, or other
11 benefits.

12 32. A significant element of the BitTorrent economic model is that those who
13 participate and download movies not only share and upload movies with others, but participants
14 are often rewarded through various means based on the volume and availability of content
15 participants in turn provide the network. In sum, there is a feedback incentive for participants as
16 they obtain not only the benefit of their pirated copy of a movie, but they obtain other benefits by
17 increasing the availability of pirated content to others. As such there are a growing number of users
18 that participate in peer-to-peer networks and receive personal gain or compensation in that the
19 networks they use reward those who provide large numbers of files for upload to others.

20 33. The use of BitTorrent does more than cause harm through the theft of intellectual
21 property. The BitTorrent distribution of pirated files is a model of business that profits from theft
22 through sales and advertising and a system of rewards and compensation to the participants, each
23 of whom contribute to and further the enterprise. Each Defendant is a participant in the BitTorrent
24 distribution of pirated files and the substantially similar conduct of each Defendant furthered a
25 model of business that profits from theft of intellectual property including Plaintiff’s motion
26 picture.

1 34. Accordingly, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 20(a)(2) each of the Defendants is therefore
2 properly joined at least because: (a) the infringement complained of herein by each of the
3 Defendants was part of a series of transactions involving an identical copy of Plaintiff's
4 copyrighted work; (b) the conduct of each Defendant jointly and collectively supported and
5 advanced an economic business model of profiting from the piracy of Plaintiff's copyrighted work;
6 (c) there are common questions of law and fact; and (c) each Defendant knowingly and actively
7 participated in a conspiracy to perform an illegal act and/or injure Plaintiff through use of the
8 BitTorrent protocol to infringe Plaintiff's copyrighted work.

9 35. Permissive joinder in the instant case is to permit a more efficient management of
10 Plaintiff's claims against the several Defendants and to reduce the costs to Plaintiff and Defendants
11 and to reduce the costs and burdens on the Court. Notice is provided, that on being specifically
12 identified and on request from an identified Defendant, Plaintiff agrees to sever any Defendant
13 that claims prejudice in being joined in this matter and to proceed against each such Defendant
14 individually.

15 **VII. CAUSE OF ACTION—COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT**

16 36. Plaintiff realleges the substance of the prior paragraphs.

17 37. Plaintiff owns the exclusive rights to the commercially released motion picture *The*
18 *Cobbler*, which has significant value and has been acquired, produced and created at considerable
19 expense.

20 38. At all relevant times Plaintiff has been the holder of the pertinent exclusive rights
21 infringed by Defendants to the copyrighted motion picture *The Cobbler*. The motion picture is the
22 subject of a valid Certificate of Copyright Registration.

23 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each Defendant, without the permission or
24 consent of Plaintiff, has used, and continues to use, an online media distribution system to
25 wrongfully misappropriate, reproduce and distribute to the public, including by making available
26 for distribution to others, *The Cobbler*. On information and belief, each Defendant participated in

1 a swarm and/or reproduced and/or distributed the same seed file of *The Cobbler* in digital form
2 either directly with each other. Plaintiff has identified each Defendant by the IP address assigned
3 to that Defendant by his or her ISP and the date and at the time at which the infringing activity of
4 each Defendant was observed.

5 40. In addition or in the alternative, Defendants obtained Internet access through an ISP
6 and permitted, facilitated and materially contributed to the extensive use of the Internet through
7 his ISP for infringing Plaintiff's exclusive rights under The Copyright Act by others. Defendants,
8 with knowledge of the infringing conduct, failed to reasonably secure, police and protect the use
9 of his Internet service against use for improper purposes such as piracy, including the downloading
10 and sharing of Plaintiff's motion picture by others. Defendants had the right and ability to supervise
11 and control the activity constituting the infringement.

12 41. In doing so, each Defendant has directly, indirectly and/or contributorily violated
13 Plaintiff's exclusive rights of at least reproduction, preparation derivative works and distribution.
14 Each Defendant's actions constitute infringement of Plaintiff's exclusive rights protected under
15 17 U.S.C. § 101 et seq.

16 42. *The Cobbler* contains a copyright notice advising the viewer that the motion picture
17 is protected by the copyright laws. Each of the Defendants' actions with respect to copyright
18 infringement and other acts described herein were made with full knowledge of Plaintiff's
19 ownership of the copyrights in the motion picture.

20 43. The conduct of each Defendant is causing and, unless enjoined and restrained by
21 this Court, will continue to cause the Plaintiff great and irreparable injury that cannot fully be
22 compensated or measured in money. The Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Pursuant to
23 17 U.S.C. §§ 502 and 503, the Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief prohibiting each Defendant
24 from further infringing the Plaintiff's copyright and ordering that each Defendant destroy all copies
25 of the copyrighted motion picture made in violation of the Plaintiff's copyrights.
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 9th day of March, 2016.

s/David A. Lowe, WSBA No. 24,453
Lowe@LoweGrahamJones.com
LOWE GRAHAM JONES^{PLLC}
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98104
T: 206.381.3300
F: 206.381.3301

Attorneys for Cobbler Nevada, LLC