JS 44 (Rev. 09/11)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil coversheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States inSeptember 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Patrick Collins, Inc.				DEFENDANTS John Does 1-14			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Los Angeles County, C (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			, CA	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Philadelphia County (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Fiore & Barber, LLC, 425) (215) 256-0205	address, and Telephone Number Main Street, Suite 200), Harleysville, PA,	19438	Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	lot a Party)		(For Diversity Cases Only) PT en of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi)	p of Parties in Item III)	5- 85-00	en of Another State	of Business In A	Another State	
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT					NAW PYPECY.	OTHER CHATTERS	
CONTRACT	PERSONAL INJURY	PEDSONAL INIUD		ORFEITURE/PENALTY 25 Drug Related Seizure	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES 375 False Claims Act	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury		of Property 21 USC 881 00 Other	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS ■ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	375 Faise Claims Act 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability	20013	LABOR	□ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	Liability ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice	PERSONAL PROPEI 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	72 74 75 75	10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical Leave Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Empl. Ret. Inc.	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	□ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS	Security Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 899 Administrative Procedure	
 □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property 	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other ☐ 448 Education	□ 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence Habeas Corpus: □ 530 General □ 535 Death Penalty □ 540 Mandamus & Ot □ 550 Civil Rights □ 555 Prison Condition □ 560 Civil Detaince - Conditions of Confinement	her	IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 63 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) 65 Other Immigration Actions	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
✓ 1 Original	ite Court	Appellate Court	Reo	pened anothe			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON 17 U.S.C. §101 Brief description of ca	nuse:	re filing	(Do not cite jurisdictional sta	tutes unless diversity):	· .	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	Copyright Infring CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P.	IS A CLASS ACTIO		DEMAND \$ 000.00	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER		
Ghsh		SIGNATURE OF A	TORNEY	OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	AOI DIT	ADDI VINIO IPP		нист	MAC TO	DGE	
RECEIPT # Al	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUI		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: All infringements occurred water (Use Reverse Side For Accident or Transaction): All infringements occurred water (Use Reverse Side For Accident Sid	Additional Space) and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? Yes□ No Yes□ No Yes□ No			
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation at (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? Yes□ No Yes□ No Yes□ No Yes□ No			
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Yes□ NoX Yes□ NoX			
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge	Yes□ No X			
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge				
Case Number: Judge				
	D			
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	Date Terminated:			
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one ye	year previously terminated action in this count?			
	Vaa□ Na ™			
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior saction in this court?	suit pending or within one year previously terminated			
action in and court:				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier r	Yes□ No XX numbered case pending or within one year previously			
terminated action in this court?	Yes□ No X			
4. Tashin and a second	00 00 -4-A			
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	ts case filed by the same individual?			
	Yes□ No ∑ X			
CIVIL: (Place V in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)				
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:			
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts			
2. □ FELA				
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	 □ Airplane Personal Injury □ Assault, Defamation 			
4. □ Antitrust				
5. Patent	4. □ Marine Personal Injury			
6. Labor-Management Relations	5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury			
7. □ Civil Rights	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)			
8. □ Habeas Corpus	7. Products Liability			
□ Securities Act(s) Cases	8. Products Liability — Asbestos			
	9. □ All other Diversity Cases			
0. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)			
1. X All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)				
(- 1.1.00 speed))				
ARBITRATION CERTI				
Christopher P. Fiore (Check Appropriate Cate of record do hereby certify)	tegory)			
☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be	clief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of			
130,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	delication and experience of the sum of			
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.				
ATE: 6/25/12	83018			
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#			
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	e has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.			
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or w	rithin one year previously terminated actions and			
cept as noted above.	one year previously terminated action in this court			
ATE:				
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#			

Case 2:12-cv-03641-MAM Document 1 Filed 06/28/12 Page 3 of 16

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: 8015 Deering Avenue, Canoga Park, CA	91304	
Address of Defendant: John Doe #1 - Philadelphia, PA		0.1000000000000000000000000000000000000
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: All infringements occurred w	ithin this jurisdictiona	l district.
(Use Reverse Side For A		
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation at		15 <u>122</u>
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□	No.X
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□	NoX
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:		
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:	
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:		
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one ye	ar previously terminated action in this	
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su	Yes	No 🔀
action in this court?	in pending or within one year previou	sly terminated
	Yes□	No ▼
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier no		5 5
terminated action in this court?	Yes□	No X
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	case filed by the same individual?	
	Yes□	No X
CIVIL: (Place \checkmark in one category only)		
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Case	
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. □ Insurance Contract a	and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2. Airplane Personal In	ijury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation	L
4. □ Antitrust	 □ Marine Personal Inj 	ury
5. Patent	5. Motor Vehicle Person	onal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injur	y (Please specify)
7. □ Civil Rights	7. Products Liability	
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability —	- Asbestos
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity (Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)	
11. X All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)		
A D D I TO A COOPER	FIGATION	
ARBITRATION CERTING (Check Appropriate Cate) I, Christopher P. Fiore , counsel of record do hereby certify.	egory)	
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be	elief, the damages recoverable in this c	ivil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought.		
- Renet other than monetary damages is sought.		
DATE: 6/25/12	83	018
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there		rmey I.D.# 3.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or w except as noted above.	ithin one year previously terminated	action in this court
DATE:	· .	
Attorney-at-Law CIV. 609 (5/2012)	Attorn	ney I.D.#

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Patrick Collins, Inc.

CIVIL ACTION

<u> </u>	FAX Number	FAX Number F		E-Mail Address			
(215) 256-0205 (215) 256-9		5	CFiore@FioreBarber.c	om_			
Date	Attorney-at-la		Attorney for				
6/25/12	Christopher P.	Fiore	Plaintiff				
f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.							
e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) (X)							
d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.							
c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()							
b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.							
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases	(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:							
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for blaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on he plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track o which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.							
John Does 1	Does 1-14 NO.						
v.	:						

(Civ. 660) 10/02

EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA				
		X		
THE STATE OF THE S		:		
PATRICK COLLINS, INC.,		:		
		51 ¥ 85 11 • 04	Civil Action No	
	Plaintiff,	:		
		:		
vs.		:		
		•		
JOHN DOES 1-14,		%±1 (₹2		
		:		
	Defendants.	•		
		:		
		X		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COMPLAINT-ACTION FOR DAMAGES FOR PROPERTY RIGHTS INFRINGMENT

Plaintiff, Patrick Collins, Inc., by and through its counsel, Fiore & Barber, LLC, sues John Does 1-14, and alleges:

Introduction

- This matter arises under the United States Copyright Act of 1976, as amended, 17
 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq. (the "Copyright Act").
 - 2. 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

3. 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).

- 4. 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 this Court has personal jurisdiction over each Defendant because each Defendant committed the tortious conduct alleged in this Complaint in the Eastern District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and (a) each Defendant resides in the Eastern District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or (b) each Defendant has engaged in continuous and systematic business activity, or has contracted to supply goods or services in the Eastern District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 5. 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

- Plaintiff is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and has its principal place of business located at 8015 Deering Avenue, Canoga Park, CA 91304.
 - 7. Each Defendant is known to Plaintiff only by an IP address.
- 8. 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.
- 9. The ISP to which each Defendant subscribes can correlate the Defendant's IP address to the Defendant's true identity.

Joinder

10. 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) 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

- 11. Plaintiff is the owner of United States Copyright Registration Number PA0001788533 (the "Registration") for the motion picture entitled "Best New Starlets 2012" (the "Work").
 - 12. The Work was registered on or about January 26, 2012.
- 13. A copy of an internet screen shot from the U.S. Copyright Office's website evidencing, among other things, Plaintiff's ownership of the Registration and the registration date is attached as Exhibit B.
 - II. Defendants Used BitTorrent To Infringe Plaintiff's Copyright
- 14. BitTorrent is one of the most common peer-to-peer file sharing protocols (in other words, set of computer rules) used for distributing large amounts 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.com is attached as Exhibit C.

- 15. 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 and upload from each other simultaneously (one computer connected to numerous computers).
 - A. Each Defendant Installed a BitTorrent Client onto his or her Computer
 - 16. Each Defendant installed a BitTorrent Client onto his or her computer.
- 17. A BitTorrent "Client" is a software program that implements the BitTorent protocol. There are numerous such software programs including µTorrent and Vuze, both of which can be directly downloaded from the internet. See www.utorrent.com and http://new.vuze-downloads.com/.
- 18. 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
- 19. 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.
- 20. The Client takes the target computer file, the "initial seed," here the copyrighted Work, and divides it into identically sized groups of bits known as "pieces."
 - 21. The Client then gives each one of the computer file's pieces, in this case, pieces

of the copyrighted Work, a random and unique alphanumeric identifier known as a "hash" and records these hash identifiers in the torrent file.

- 22. 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.
- 23. Torrent files also have an "announce" section, which specifies the URL (Uniform Resource Locator) of a "tracker," and an "info" section, containing (suggested) names for the files, their lengths, the piece length used, and the hash identifier for each piece, all of which are used by Clients on peer computers to verify the integrity of the data they receive.
- 24. 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).
- 25. 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 Work, on them and facilitates the exchange of data among the computers.
- 26. 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

- 27. "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 www.TorrentZap.com, www.Btscene.com, and www.ExtraTorrent.com.
 - 28. Upon information and belief, each Defendant went to a torrent site to upload and

download Plaintiff's copyrighted Work.

- D. <u>Uploading and Downloading a Work Through a BitTorrent Swarm</u>
- 29. Once the initial seeder has created a torrent and uploaded it onto one or more torrent sites then other peers begin to download and upload the computer file to which the torrent is linked (here the copyrighted Work) using the BitTorrent protocol and BitTorrent Client that the peers installed on their computers.
- 30. The BitTorrent protocol causes the initial seed's computer to send different pieces of the computer file, here the copyrighted Work, to the peers seeking to download the computer file.
- 31. Once a peer receives a piece of the computer file, here a piece of the Copyrighted Work, it starts transmitting that piece to the other peers.
- 32. In this way, all of the peers and seeders are working together in what is called a "swarm."
- 33. 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.
- 34. 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 Work here, upload the torrent onto a torrent site, and 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.

- 35. 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. Also, once a peer has downloaded the full file, that peer becomes known as "an additional seed" because it continues to distribute the torrent file, here the copyrighted Work.
 - E. Plaintiff's Computer Investigators Identified Each of the Defendants' IP Addresses as Participants in a Swarm That Was Distributing Plaintiff's Copyrighted Work
- 36. 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.
- 37. 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.
- 38. 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 58046BCCA813271DCC68D7BA6F52B65888614C71 (the "Unique Hash Number").
- 39. 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 Work identified by the Unique Hash Number; and
 - (B) Therefore, each Defendant was part of the same series of transactions.
- 40. Through each of the transactions, each of the Defendant's computers used their identified IP addresses to connect to the investigative server from a computer in this District in

order to transmit a full copy, or a portion thereof, of a digital media file identified by the Unique Hash Number.

- 41. IPP's agent analyzed each BitTorrent "piece" distributed by each IP address listed on Exhibit A and verified that re-assemblage of the pieces using a BitTorrent Client results in a fully playable digital motion picture of the Work.
- 42. IPP's agent viewed the Work side-by-side with the digital media file that correlates to the Unique Hash Number and determined that they were identical, strikingly similar or substantially similar.

Miscellaneous

- 43. All conditions precedent to bringing this action have occurred or been waived.
- 44. Plaintiff retained counsel to represent it in this matter and is obligated to pay said counsel a reasonable fee for its services.

COUNT I <u>Direct Infringement Against Does 1-14</u>

- 45. The allegations contained in paragraphs 1-44 are hereby re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 46. Plaintiff is the owner of the Registration for the Work which contains an original work of authorship.
- 47. By using the BitTorrent protocol and a BitTorrent Client and the processes described above, each Defendant copied the constituent elements of the registered Work that are original.
 - 48. Plaintiff did not authorize, permit or consent to Defendants' copying of its Work.
 - 49. As a result of the foregoing, each Defendant violated Plaintiff's exclusive right to:
 - (A) Reproduce the Work in copies, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(1) and 501;

- (B) Redistribute copies of the Work 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 Work, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(4) and 501, by showing the Work's images in any sequence and/or by making the sounds accompanying the Work audible and transmitting said performance of the Work, 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 Work, in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(5) and 501, by showing individual images of the Work nonsequentially and transmitting said display of the Work 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).
- 50. Each of the Defendants' infringements was committed "willfully" within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).
- 51. 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 Work;
- (B) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the torrent file relating to Plaintiff's copyrighted Work 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 Work

each Defendant has on the computers under Defendant's possession, custody or control;

- (D) Award Plaintiff the greater of: (i) statutory damages in the amount of \$150,000 per Defendant, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a) and (c), or (ii) Plaintiff's actual damages and any additional profits of the Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a)-(b);
- (E) Award Plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505; and
 - (F) Grant Plaintiff any other and further relief this Court deems just and proper.

COUNT II Contributory Infringement Against Does 1-14

- 52. The allegations contained in paragraphs 1-44 are hereby re-alleged as if fully set forth herein.
- 53. Plaintiff is the owner of the Registration for the Work which contains an original work of authorship.
- 54. By using the BitTorrent protocol and a BitTorrent Client and the processes described above, each Defendant copied the constituent elements of the registered Work that are original.
- 55. By participating in the BitTorrent swarm with the other Defendants, each Defendant induced, caused or materially contributed to the infringing conduct of each other Defendant.
- 56. Plaintiff did not authorize, permit or consent to Defendants' inducing, causing or materially contributing to the infringing conduct of each other Defendant.
- 57. Each Defendant knew or should have known that other BitTorrent users, here the other Defendants, would become members of a swarm with Defendant.
 - 58. 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 Work by copying constituent elements of the registered Work that are original.

- 59. Indeed, each Defendant directly participated in and therefore materially contributed to each other Defendant's infringing activities.
- 60. Each of the Defendants' contributory infringements were committed "willfully" within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).
- 61. 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 Work;
- (B) Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the torrent file relating to Plaintiff's copyrighted Work 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 Work each Defendant has on the computers under Defendant's possession, custody or control;
- (D) Find that each Defendant is jointly and severally liable for the direct infringement of each other Defendant;
- (E) Award Plaintiff the greater of: (i) statutory damages in the amount of \$150,000 per Defendant, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a) and (c), or (ii) Plaintiff's actual damages and any additional profits of the Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504-(a)-(b);
 - (F) Award Plaintiff its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §

505; and

(G) Grant Plaintiff any other and further relief this Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

FIORE & BARBER, LLC

By:

Christopher P. Fiore, Esquire Aman M. Barber, III, Esquire Attorneys for Plaintiff

425 Main Street, Suite 200 Harleysville, PA 19438

Tel: (215) 256-0205 Fax: (215) 256-9205

Email: cfiore@fiorebarber.com