	1	į						
1	Adam M. Silverstein (197638)							
2	CAVALLUZZI & CAVALLUZZI							
3	9200 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 807							
4	Los Angeles, California 90069							
5	Telephone: (310) 246-2601							
6	Facsimile: (310) 246-2606							
7	Email: adam@cavalluzzi.com							
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff							
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
10	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
11	MATIDIIMEDIA II C							
12	MALIBU MEDIA, LLC, a California corporation,	Case No. '12CV0362 LAB POR						
13	Plaintiff,							
14	vs.							
15	vs.	COMPLAINT						
16	JOHN DOES 1-25,							
17	Defendants.							
18	Defendants.							
19	Plaintiff, Malibu Media, LLC, sues J	ohn Does 1-25, and alleges:						
20	Introduction							
21	1. This matter arises under the United States Copyright Act of 1976, as							
22								
23	amended, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq. (the "Copyright Act").							
24	2. Each of the Defendants copied and distributed most of a website							
25 26	containing 57 movies. This is known as a "siterip." The file containing the subject							
27	website is so large that the Defendants' computers must have worked collaboratively							
28	5	Case No.						
	<u> </u>	Case No.						

with each other through the process described below for numerous weeks or months to effectuate a complete download and redistribution of the subject website.<sup>1</sup>

- 3. Throughout this Complaint the word "Works" refers to 57 movies contained on the subject website.
  - 4. Through this suit, Plaintiff alleges each Defendant is liable for:
  - Direct copyright infringement in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106 and 501;
     and
  - Contributory copyright infringement.

# Jurisdiction And Venue

- 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); and 28 U.S.C. § 1338 (patents, copyrights, trademarks and unfair competition).
- 6. As set forth on Exhibit A, each of the Defendants' acts of copyright infringement occurred using an Internet Protocol address ("IP address") traced to a physical address located within this District, and therefore pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 410.10, this Court has personal jurisdiction over each Defendant because each Defendant committed the tortious conduct alleged in this Complaint in the State of California, and (a) each Defendant resides in the State of California, and/or (b)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The hit dates listed in the exhibits are not evidence of when a particular Defendant started the download but are merely evidence of when the investigator's server recorded an IP address sending a particular piece of data.

each Defendant has engaged in continuous and systematic business activity in the State of California.

7. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), because: (i) a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District; and, (ii) a Defendant resides (and therefore can be found) in this District and all of the Defendants reside in this State; additionally, venue is proper in this District pursuant 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a) (venue for copyright cases) because each Defendant or each Defendant's agent resides or may be found in this District.

#### **Parties**

- 8. Plaintiff is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and has its principal place of business located at 31356 Broad Beach Road, Malibu, CA 90265.
  - 9. Each Defendant is known to Plaintiff only by an IP address.
- 10. An IP address is a number that is assigned by an Internet Service Provider (an "ISP") to devices, such as computers, that are connected to the Internet.
- 11. The ISP to which each Defendant subscribes can correlate the Defendant's IP address to the Defendant's true identity.

### <u>Joinder</u>

12. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 20(a)(2), each of the Defendants was properly joined because, as set forth in more detail below, Plaintiff asserts that: (a)

Case No.

11

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

27

28

26

each of the Defendants is jointly and severally liable for the infringing activities of each of the other Defendants, and (b) the infringement complained of herein by each of the Defendants was part of a series of transactions, involving the exact same torrent file containing of Plaintiff's copyrighted Works, and was accomplished by the Defendants acting in concert with each other, and (c) there are common questions of law and fact; indeed, the claims against each of the Defendants are identical and each of the Defendants used the BitTorrent protocol to infringe Plaintiff's copyrighted Works.

# **Factual Background**

- Plaintiff Owns the Copyright to the Motion Pictures I.
- Plaintiff's Works are subject to copyright protection pursuant to 17 13. U.S.C. §§ 104(b)(1)-(3) because one or more of the authors is a national or domiciliary of a treaty party; the Works were first published in a foreign nation that is a treaty party; and the Works qualify as a sound recording that was first fixed in the territory of a treaty party.
- Registering the copyrights is not a condition precedent to bringing this 14. action under 17 U.S.C. § 411 (a) because the subject copyrights are not "United States Work(s)" within the meaning of that statute. Instead, the Works underlying the copyrights were created and/or published within the territory of a treaty party.
- Within the time limits prescribed by 17 U.S.C. § 412, Plaintiff 15. Registered 11 of the 57 movies contained on the subject website with the United Case No.

States Copyright Office.

BitTorrent is one of the most common peer-to-peer file sharing

The BitTorrent protocol's popularity stems from its ability to distribute

a large file without creating a heavy load on the source computer and network. In

short, to reduce the load on the source computer, rather than downloading a file from

a single source computer (one computer directly connected to another), the

BitTorrent protocol allows users to join a "swarm" of host computers to download

A copy of each of the Registrations is attached as

Composite Exhibit B along with a list of the titles of the other 46 works.

II. Defendants Used BitTorrent To Infringe Plaintiff's Copyright

5 6

8

9

10

11

12

13

protocols (in other words, set of computer rules) used for distributing large amounts

16.

of data; indeed, it has been estimated that users using the BitTorrent protocol on the

internet account for over a quarter of all internet traffic. The creators and user's of

BitTorrent developed their own lexicon for use when talking about BitTorrent; a

copy of the BitTorrent vocabulary list posted on www.Wikipedia.org is attached as

Exhibit C.

17.

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

and upload from each other simultaneously (one computer connected to numerous

computers).

Each Defendant Installed a BitTorrent Client onto his or her Computer A.

Each Defendant installed a BitTorrent Client onto his or her computer.

18. 19.

A BitTorrent "Client" is a software program that implements the

BitTorent protocol. There are numerous such software programs including μTorrent

Case No.

and Vuze, both of which can be directly downloaded from the internet. <u>See www.utorrent.com</u> and <a href="http://new.vuze-downloads.com/">http://new.vuze-downloads.com/</a>.

- 20. Once installed on a computer, the BitTorrent "Client" serves as the user's interface during the process of uploading and downloading data using the BitTorrent protocol.
  - B. The Initial Seed, Torrent, Hash and Tracker
- 21. A BitTorrent user that wants to upload a new file, known as an "initial seeder," starts by creating a "torrent" descriptor file using the Client he or she installed onto his or her computer.
- 22. The Client takes the target computer file, the "initial seed," here the subject website containing the copyrighted Works, and divides it into groups of bits known as "pieces."
- 23. The Client then gives each one of the computer file's pieces, in this case, pieces of the copyrighted Works, a random and unique alphanumeric identifier known as a "hash" and records these hash identifiers in the torrent file.
- 24. When another peer later receives a particular piece, the hash identifier for that piece is compared to the hash identifier recorded in the torrent file for that piece to test that the piece is error-free. In this way, the hash identifier works like an electronic fingerprint to identify the source and origin of the piece and that the piece is authentic and uncorrupted.
  - 25. Torrent files also have an "announce" section, which specifies the <u>URL</u>

    Case No.

(Uniform Resource Locator) of a "tracker," and an "info" section, containing (suggested) names for the files, their lengths, the piece length used, and the <u>hash</u> identifier for each piece, all of which are used by Clients on peer computers to verify the integrity of the data they receive.

- 26. The "tracker" is a computer or set of computers that a torrent file specifies and to which the torrent file provides peers with the URL address(es).
- 27. The tracker computer or computers direct a peer user's computer to other peer user's computers that have particular pieces of the file, here the copyrighted Works, on them and facilitates the exchange of data among the computers.
- 28. Depending on the BitTorrent Client, a tracker can either be a dedicated computer (centralized tracking) or each peer can act as a tracker (decentralized tracking).

### C. Torrent Sites

- 29. "Torrent sites" are websites that index torrent files that are currently being made available for copying and distribution by people using the BitTorrent protocol. There are numerous torrent websites, including <a href="www.TorrentZap.com">www.TorrentZap.com</a>, <a href="www.Btscene.com">www.ExtraTorrent.com</a>, and <a href="www.piratebay.org">www.piratebay.org</a>.
- 30. Upon information and belief, each Defendant went to a torrent site to upload and download Plaintiff's copyrighted Works.

Case No.

D. <u>Uploading and Downloading Works Through a BitTorrent Swarm</u>

31. Once the initial seeder has created a torrent and uploaded it onto a torrent site then other peers begin to download and upload the computer file to which the torrent is linked (here the copyrighted Works) using the BitTorrent protocol and BitTorrent Client that the peers installed on their computers.

- 32. The BitTorrent protocol causes the initial seed's computer to send different pieces of the computer file, here the copyrighted Works, to the peers seeking to download the computer file.
- 33. Once a peer receives a piece of the computer file, here a piece of the Copyrighted Works, it starts transmitting that piece to the other peers.
- 34. In this way, all of the peers and seeders are working together in what is called a "swarm."
- 35. Here, each Defendant peer member participated in the same swarm and directly interacted and communicated with other members of that swarm through digital handshakes, the passing along of computer instructions, uploading and downloading, and by other types of transmissions. A print out of a computer screen illustrating the type of interactions between and among peers and seeders in a typical swarm is attached as Exhibit D.
- 36. In this way, and by way of example only, one initial seeder can create a torrent that breaks a movie up into hundreds or thousands of pieces saved in the form of a computer file, like the Works here, upload the torrent onto a torrent site, and Case No.

deliver a different piece of the copyrighted work to each of the peers. The recipient peers then automatically begin delivering the piece they just received to the other peers in the same swarm.

- 37. Once a peer, here a Defendant, has downloaded the full file, the BitTorrent Client reassembles the pieces and the peer is able to view the movie.
  - E. Plaintiff's Computer Investigators Identified Each of the Defendants' IP Addresses as Participants in a Swarm That Was Distributing Plaintiff's Copyrighted Works
- 38. Plaintiff retained IPP, Limited ("IPP") to identify the IP addresses that are being used by those people that are using the BitTorrent protocol and the internet to reproduce, distribute, display or perform Plaintiffs' copyrighted works.
- 39. IPP used forensic software named INTERNATIONAL IPTRACKER v1.2.1 and related technology enabling the scanning of peer-to-peer networks for the presence of infringing transactions.
- 40. IPP extracted the resulting data emanating from the investigation, reviewed the evidence logs, and isolated the transactions and the IP addresses associated therewith for the file identified by the SHA-1 hash value of 121AC0B46088E7C235A23D4379BE65A1840E9B77 (the "Unique Hash Number").
- 41. The IP addresses, Unique Hash Number and hit dates contained on Exhibit A accurately reflect what is contained in the evidence logs, and show:
  - (A) Each Defendant had copied a piece of Plaintiff's copyrighted Works

    Case No.

- 48. Plaintiff is the owner of the copyrights for the Works, each of which contains an original work of authorship.
- 49. By using the BitTorrent protocol and a BitTorrent Client and the processes described above, each Defendant copied the constituent elements of the Works that are original.
- 50. Plaintiff did not authorize, permit or consent to Defendants' copying of its Works.
- 51. As a result of the foregoing, each Defendant violated Plaintiff's exclusive right to:
- (A) Reproduce the Works in copies, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(1) and 501;
- (B) Redistribute copies of the Works to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership, or by rental, lease or lending, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(3) and 501;
- (C) Perform the copyrighted Works, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(4) and 501, by showing the Works' images in any sequence and/or by making the sounds accompanying the Works audible and transmitting said performance of the Works, by means of a device or process, to members of the public capable of receiving the display (as set forth in 17 U.S.C. § 101's definitions of "perform" and "publically" perform); and
  - (D) Display the copyrighted Works, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(5) and Case No.

501, by showing individual images of the Works nonsequentially and transmitting said display of the Works by means of a device or process to members of the public capable of receiving the display (as set forth in 17 U.S.C. § 101's definition of "publically" display).

- 52. Each of the Defendants' infringements was committed "willfully" within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).
- 53. Plaintiff has suffered actual damages that were proximately caused by each of the Defendants including lost sales, price erosion and a diminution of the value of its copyrights.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

- (A) Permanently enjoin each Defendant and all other persons who are in active concert or participation with each Defendant from continuing to infringe Plaintiff's copyrighted Works;
- (B) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the torrent file relating to Plaintiff's copyrighted Works from each of the computers under each such Defendant's possession, custody or control;
- (C) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the copy of the Works each Defendant has on the computers under Defendant's possession, custody or control;
- (D) Award Plaintiff statutory damages in the amount of \$150,000 per Defendant, per registered Work infringed, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a) and (c), Case No.

- 59. Each Defendant knew or should have known that other BitTorrent users, here the other Defendants, would become members of a swarm with Defendant.
- 60. Each Defendant knew or should have known that other BitTorrent users in a swarm with it, here the other Defendants, were directly infringing Plaintiff's copyrighted Works by copying constituent elements of the Works that are original.
- 61. Indeed, each Defendant directly participated in and therefore materially contributed to each other Defendant's infringing activities.
- 62. Each of the Defendants' contributory infringements were committed "willfully" within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).
- 63. Plaintiff has suffered actual damages that were proximately caused by each of the Defendants including lost sales, price erosion, and a diminution of the value of its copyright.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

- (A) Permanently enjoin each Defendant and all other persons who are in active concert or participation with each Defendant from continuing to infringe Plaintiff's copyrighted Works;
- (B) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the torrent file relating to Plaintiff's copyrighted Works from each of the computers under each such Defendant's possession, custody or control;
- (C) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the copy of the Works each Defendant has on the computers under Defendant's possession,

custody or control; 1 Find that each Defendant is jointly and severally liable for the direct 2 (D) 3 infringement of each other Defendant; 4 Award Plaintiff statutory damages in the amount of \$150,000 per (E) 5 Defendant, per registered Work infringed, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a) and (c), 6 whichever is greater; 8 Award Plaintiff its actual damages and any additional profits of the (F) 9 10 Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a)-(b); 11 Award Plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 17 (G) 12 U.S.C. § 505; and 13 14 Grant Plaintiff any other and further relief this Court deems just and (E) 15 proper. 16 **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL** 17 18 Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable. 19 Respectfully submitted, 20 By: /s/ Adam M. Silverstein 21 Adam M. Silverstein (197638) 22 CAVALLUZZI & CAVALLUZZI 9200 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 807 23 Los Angeles, California 90069 24 Telephone: (310) 246-2601 Facsimile: (310) 246-2606 25 Email: adam@cavalluzzi.com 26 Attorneys for Plaintiff 27 28 Case No.

Case 3:12-cv-00362-LAB-ROR Decument 1 Filed 02/09/12 Page 16 of 16

©JS 44 (Rev. 12/07)	CIVIL	COAF	RSHEET			
The JS 44 civil cover sheet and by local rules of court. This for the civil docket sheet. (SBE)	d the information contained herein neither replace orm, approved by the Judicial Conference of the U NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM	nor suppleme Inited States in .)	nt the filing and service of n September 1974, is requ	pleadings or other papers as re fired for the use of the Clerk of	equired by law, except as provided Court for the purpose of initiating	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS MALIBU MEDIA, LLC			DEFENDANTS JOHN DOES 1-25			
			JOHN BOLS 1-23			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Los Angeles County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  San Diego County			
,	,		NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.			
	c, Address, and Telephone Number) , 9200 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 807 -2601	, Los	Attorneys (If Known)  '12CV0362 LAB POR			
II. BASIS OF JURISI				RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
T 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	▼ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) P1 en of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity  (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III		en of Another State	2 J 2 Incorporated and I of Business In A		
-		Citize	en or Subject of a  reign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	<b>0</b> 6 <b>0</b> 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	TORTS	F	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ Enforcement of Judgmen ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Forcelosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 330 Federal Employers' Liability □ 340 Marine □ 345 Marine Product Liability □ 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Len 370 Other Person □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 385 Property Dan 385 Property Dan	ary -	10 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug 25 Drug Related Scizure of Property 21 USC 881 30 Liquor Laws 10 R.R. & Truck 50 Airline Regs. 50 Occupational Safety/Health 90 Other  LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 50 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 10 Railway Labor Act 10 Other Labor Litigation 91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act  IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 53 Habeas Corpus Alien Detainee 55 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS ■ 820 Copyrights ■ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY ■ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) ■ FEDERAL TAX SUITS ■ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 400 State Reapportionment     □ 410 Antitrust     □ 430 Banks and Banking     □ 450 Commerce     □ 460 Deportation     □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations     □ 480 Consumer Credit     □ 490 Cable/Sat TV     □ 810 Selective Service     □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange     □ 875 Customer Challenge     □ 12 USC 3410     □ 890 Other Statutory Actions     □ 891 Agricultural Acts     □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act     □ 893 Environmental Matters     □ 894 Energy Allocation Act     □ 895 Freedom of Information Act     □ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice     □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
X 1 Original ☐ 2 R	Copyright Infringement  CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACT UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	Reopou are filing (	pened another (specific pened) another (specif	al statutes unless diversity):	Magistrate Judgment  if demanded in complaint:	
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	grand grand de skillede killede				_	

RECEIPT # \_\_\_\_\_AMOUNT \_\_\_\_\_APPLYING IFP \_\_\_\_\_JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_MAG. JUDGE \_\_\_\_