Frederic M. Douglas (Calif. State Bar # 212778) Attorney At Law 15333 Culver Drive, Suite 340 2 Irvine, California 92604-3051 Tel: (949) 293-0442 Fax: (949) 203-8768 fdouglas@cox.net 4 Attorney for Plaintiff YIGAL MESIKA 5 6 7 THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 WESTERN DIVISION 9 YIGAL MESIKA, an individual Case No.: 10 **COMPLAINT FOR:** Plaintiff, 11 1) FEDERAL TRADEMARK VS. 12 INFRINGEMENT; PENGUIN MAGIC, INC., a Nevada 2) LANHAM ACT UNFAIR corporation, DOES 1-10, inclusive, 13 **COMPETITION**; 3) CALIFORNIA UNFAIR TRADE 14 **Defendants PRACTICES ACT:** 15 4) FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS WHEN 16 ADVERTISING ONE'S GOODS 17 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 18 19 **COMPLAINT** 20 Plaintiff YIGAL MESIKA ("Mesika" or "Plaintiff") alleges the following facts 21 upon actual knowledge with respect to himself and his own acts and upon information 22 and belief as to the actions of Defendant PENGUIN MAGIC, INC., a Nevada 23 corporation ("Penguin Magic" or "Defendant") and DOES 1-10 (collectively, 24 "Defendants"), complains and alleges as follows: 25

I. THE PARTIES

- 1. Mesika is an individual, domiciled in, and a resident of, Los Angeles, California.
- 2. On information and belief, Defendant Penguin Magic is a Nevada corporation, having its principal place of business at 1585 Heather Oaks Way, North Las Vegas, Nevada 89031. Upon further information and belief Penguin Magic maintains an agent for service of process, Acar Altinsel, with the address for service of process at 3299 Monier Circle, Unit A, Rancho Cordova, California 95742. Upon still further information and belief Acar Altinsel is president and treasurer of the Defendant corporation, with an address of record of P.O. Box 335460, North Las Vegas, Nevada 89033.
- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, Penguin Magic, and each of the DOE defendants (collectively "Defendants") is responsible in some manner for the events, occurrences and happenings herein referred to, either contractually or tortiously, and each singly or together caused the damage to the Plaintiff as herein alleged.
- 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and each of them, at all relevant times were and are the agents, employees, partners, joint venturers, owners, principals, employers or other representatives of each and every other defendant, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course and scope of such agency, employment, partnership, joint venture, representation, or ownership. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and based thereon allege, that the acts and conduct herein alleged of each such defendant were known to, authorized by, consented to or ratified by the other remaining defendants and each of them.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to: 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a), (b) for claims arising under the trademark laws of the United States, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051, et seq. and 1125. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 as the controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between Plaintiff who resides in Los Angeles County, California and Defendants, who reside in North Las Vegas, Nevada. Defendants are subject to jurisdiction of this court as Defendants, do business within this judicial district, have committed infringing acts within this district. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, supplemental jurisdiction exists, because the other claims are substantial and are so related to the federal question claims for relief that the claims form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.
- 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant in this action and venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) because, as alleged further below: (a) Defendant has intentionally engaged in substantial business within this forum amounting to sufficient minimum contacts, including, but not limited to, the offer for sale and sale of their products and/or services into California and into this district, including the use of the Internet; and (b) a substantial part of the acts or omissions giving rise to the asserted claims occurred or had effects in this judicial district. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 as Defendant is subject to the personal jurisdiction of the Court situated herein. Defendant maintains continuous and systematic commercial contacts with the State of California by, *inter alia*, purposefully availing themselves of the opportunity to conduct commercial activities, and regularly conducting business in the State of California; committing a substantial part of the wrongful acts complained of herein in interstate commerce, in the State of California, and in this judicial district; and conducting business activities in

the State of California by advertising, offering for sale, and selling competing products as complained of herein while actively and continuously soliciting and consummating commercial transactions with California residents.

III. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 7. Mesika is the owner of intellectual property related to, including inventions, patent applications, patents, trademarks, trade secrets, know how, and confidential information relating to magic tricks, demonstrations, instructions, and other means of entertainment.
- 8. Plaintiff markets, distributes, and sells products using such intellectual property rights, including under the trademark LOOPS, which is registered in the U.S. since April 27, 2010 with Registration No. 3,782,721. Plaintiff is the owner of all right, title, and interest in and to United States Trademark Registration No. 3,782,721, for the mark LOOPS as used for "magic tricks." The LOOPS mark is valid, subsisting, and incontestable. A copy of the registration of Mesika's trademark LOOPS is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
- 9. Plaintiff markets, distributes, and sells products under the trademark LOOPS, which is registered in the U.S. since June 14, 2011 with Registration No. 3,978,477. Plaintiff is the owner of all right, title, and interest in and to United States Trademark Registration No. 3,978,477, for the mark LOOPS as used for "DVDs featuring magic and levitations." The LOOPS mark is valid and subsisting. A copy of the registration of Mesika's trademark LOOPS is attached hereto as Exhibit 2.
- 10. Plaintiff has developed a fine reputation and goodwill at substantial expense associated with his LOOPS trademark and "LOOPS" products, through advertising and marketing goods and services through his website http://www.yigalmesika.com/our-products. Plaintiff also advertises and markets

LOOPS products via Amazon at http://www.amazon.com/Yigal-Mesika-ms03430-Loops-by/dp/B008Z23Y7Q. Plaintiff also attends trade shows, and participates in various industry associations, including: the Academy of Magical Arts; FISM (Federation Internationale des Societes Magiques); Magic Live; The Magic Café; Genii, The Conjurer's Magazine; Magic Magazine; and EMC (Essential Magic Conference). Plaintiff depends upon the Amazon website and Internet searches for customers and potential customers to find Plaintiff and to promote Plaintiff's products via searches for magic trick products.

- 11. Upon information and belief, Defendant advertises, markets, offers for sale, and sells products that compete with Plaintiff in the United States and in the State of California, and in this judicial district. Plaintiff's "LOOPS" products are competitive with Defendant's "LOOPS" products, described as originating from Mesika but actually an inferior product not authorized by Plaintiff.
- 12. Defendant has used the term or mark "LOOPS" as a key word or "meta tag" in its website database. Such a meta tag is essentially a programming code instruction to the Penguinmagic.com website search system. These keywords or meta tags are usually not visible to an Internet user or searcher in the Penguin Magic website. As a result, if someone types in "LOOPS" in a search at the Penguin Magic website, the search will result in Defendant's counterfeit "LOOPS" name being displayed along with the name of Defendant company Penguin Magic. Due to Defendant's actions, a search at the Penguin Magic website for "LOOPS" does not display any results listing genuine products by Plaintiff. Defendant has intentionally misappropriated and unfairly used Plaintiff's registered trademark "LOOPS" as one of its keywords, so that anyone searching for "LOOPS" on the Penguin Magic website is misdirected to counterfeit products of Defendants, rather than being directed solely to Plaintiff's products or authorized products licensed by Plaintiff to Defendant.

13. The result of this misdirection is to cause initial interest confusion, or further, alternatively, source confusion.

IV. CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT 1

FEDERAL TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

- 14. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-13 above are hereby incorporated herein by reference.
- 15. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a), Defendant has, without the consent of Plaintiff, used in commerce a reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of the LOOPS mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution, or advertising of goods or in connection with which such use is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.
- 16. Purusant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117, Plaintiff seeks Defendant's profits, damages sustained by Plaintiff, and costs of this action. Further, under the circumstances of this case, Plaintiff seeks trebling of the actual damages. Further, if the Court should find that, the recovery based on profits is inadequate; Plaintiff prays that the Court will in its discretion enter judgment for such a sum, as the Court shall find to be just.
- 17. Because of the blatant and willful nature of Defendant's infringement, Plaintiff submits that this is an exceptional case and seeks their reasonable attorneys' fees.

COUNT 2

LANHAM ACT UNFAIR COMPETITION

18. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-17 above are hereby incorporated herein by reference.

- 19. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a), Defendant has, in connection with goods, used in commerce false or misleading description of facts, or false or misleading misrepresentations of facts, which are likely to cause confusion as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of their goods by another person; or, in commercial advertising or promotion, misrepresented the nature, characteristics, or qualities of its or Plaintiff's goods or commercial activities. Plaintiff believes that he is, or is likely to be, damaged by such acts. In addition, Defendant has made false designations or origins of its product regarding using "LOOPS" as trademarks, thereby identifying their products with Plaintiff as a source.
- 20. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117, Plaintiff seeks Defendant's profits, damages sustained by Plaintiff, and costs of this action. Further, under the circumstances of this case, Plaintiff seeks trebling of the actual damages. Further, if the Court should find that, the recovery based on profits is inadequate; Plaintiff prays that the Court will in its discretion enter judgment for such a sum, as the Court shall find to be just.
- 21. Because of the blatant and willful nature of Defendant's infringement, Plaintiff submits that this is an exceptional case and seeks his reasonable attorneys' fees.

COUNT 3

CALIFORNIA UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES ACT

- 22. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-21 above are hereby incorporated herein by reference.
- 23. This claim arises under California law, including Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, and the common law.

- 24. Defendant's infringement and other actions as alleged herein constitute a per se unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business practice, and/or unfair, deceptive, untrue, and misleading advertising under California Business & Professions Code § 17000, *et seq*.
- 25. Defendant's violations of California law have been willful, deliberate, and intentional, and will no doubt continue unless enjoined by this Court.

COUNT 4

CALIFORNIA UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES ACT –FALSE OR MISLEADING STATEMENTS WHEN ADVERTISING ONE'S GOODS

- 26. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-25 above are hereby incorporated herein by reference.
- 27. This claim arises under California law, including Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17250, and the common law.
- 28. Defendant's infringement and other actions as alleged herein constitute a per se unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice, and/or unfair, deceptive, untrue, fraudulent, and misleading advertising under California Business & Professions Code § 17000, *et seq*.
- 29. Defendant's violations of California law have been willful, deliberate, and intentional, and will no doubt continue unless enjoined by this Court.

IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

- WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:
- A. Preliminary and permanent injunction against further violations of 35 U.S.C. § 292(a) by Defendant, as well as enjoining any future acts of trademark infringement and acts of unfair competition by Defendant against Plaintiff, including,

1	but not limited to, ordering Defendant not to use Plaintiff's trademarks in any industry		
2	database or website as a keyword or meta tag, nor any other uses of Plaintiff's		
3	trademarks;		
4	В.	Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 13	117(a), it be declared an exceptional case and
5	Defendant be required to pay all of Plaintiff's costs and attorneys' fees;		
6	C.	Defendant's profits;	
7	D.	Plaintiff's damages;	
8	E.	Exemplary damages and treble damages;	
9	F.	Reasonable and necessary	attorneys' fees as provided by California law
10	and other law;		
11	G.	Court costs;	
12	H.	Prejudgment and post-judg	gment interest; and
13	I.	For such other and further	relief that the Court deems just and proper.
14	December 2, 2015		Respectfully submitted,
15			/s/ Frederic M. Douglas
16			Frederic M. Douglas
17			Frederic M. Douglas Calif. State Bar # 212778 Attorney At Law
18			15333 Culver Drive, Suite 340 Irvine, California 92604-3051
19			Tel: (949) 293-0442 Fax: (949) 203-8768
20			fdouglas@cox.net
21			Attorneys for Plaintiff
22			Attorney for Plaintiff YIGAL MESIKA
23			
24	////		
25			

PLAINTIFF'S DEMAND FOR JURY Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury. December 2, 2015 /s/ Frederic M. Douglas_ Frederic M. Douglas Frederic M. Douglas Calif. State Bar # 212778 Attorney At Law 15333 Culver Drive, Suite 340 Irvine, California 92604-3051 Tel: (949) 293-0442 Fax: (949) 203-8768 fdouglas@cox.net Attorneys for Plaintiff Attorney for Plaintiff YIGAL MESIKA