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 COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
11	DAWEII MC I TD						
12	RAW FILMS, LTD., a California corporation,	Case No. 12CV0368 WQHNLS					
13	Plaintiff,						
14	vs.						
15	v 5.	COMPLAINT					
16	JOHN DOES 1-11,						
17	Defendants.						
18							
19	Plaintiff, Raw Films, Ltd., sues John Does 1-11, and alleges:						
20	Introduction						
21 22							
23	1. This matter arises under the United States Copyright Act of 1976, as						
24	amended, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 et seq. (the "Copyright Act").						
25	2. Through this suit, Plaintiff alleges each Defendant is liable for:						
26							
27	• Direct copyright infringement in violation of 17 U.S.C. §§ 106 and						
28	501; and						
<b></b> 0		Case No.					

• 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 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) each Defendant has engaged in continuous and systematic business activity in the State of California.
- 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**

- 6. Plaintiff is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the United Kingdom, with its principal place of business located at 37 Warren Street, London, W1t 6ad, United Kingdom.
  - 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.

#### <u>Joinder</u>

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 the same series of transaction, involving the exact same piece of Plaintiff's copyrighted Work, 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 Work.

## Factual Background

## I. Plaintiff Owns the Copyright to a Motion Picture

- 11. Plaintiff's work is subject to copyright protection for the motion picture entitled "Bareback Street Gang" (the "Work"), pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §§ 104(b)(1)-(3) because one or more of the authors is a national or domiciliary of a treaty party; the Work was first published in a foreign nation that is a treaty party; and the Work qualifies as a sound recording that was first fixed in the territory of a treaty party.
- 12. Registering the copyright is not a condition precedent to bringing this action under 17 U.S.C. § 411 (a) because the subject copyright is not a "United States Work" within the meaning of that statute. Instead, the work underlying the copyright was created and/or published within the territory of a treaty party.

## II. <u>Defendants Used BitTorrent To Infringe Plaintiff's Copyright</u>

- 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 users of BitTorrent developed their own lexicon for use when talking about BitTorrent; a copy of the BitTorrent vocabulary list posted on <a href="https://www.Wikipedia.org">www.Wikipedia.org</a> is attached as Exhibit B.
- 14. 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 Case No.

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
- 15. Each Defendant installed a BitTorrent Client onto his or her computer.
- 16. 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/.
- 17. 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
- 18. 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.
- 19. 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."

- 20. 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.
- 21. 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.
- 22. Torrent files also have an "announce" section, which specifies the <u>URL</u> (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.
- 23. 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).
- 24. 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.
- 25. Depending on the BitTorrent Client, a tracker can either be a dedicated computer (centralized tracking) or each peer can act as a tracker (decentralized Case No.

32. 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 C.

33. 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.

34. 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
- 35. 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.
- 36. 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.
- 37. 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 D0DE9062102977D136A7D055953D5D57A088C1E4, (the "Unique Hash Number").
- 38. 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.
- 39. 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 Case No.

original work of authorship.

- 53. By using the BitTorrent protocol and a BitTorrent Client and the processes described above, each Defendant copied the constituent elements of the Work that are original.
- 54. 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.
- 55. Plaintiff did not authorize, permit or consent to Defendants' inducing, causing or materially contributing to the infringing conduct of each other Defendant.
- 56. Each Defendant knew or should have known that other BitTorrent users, here the other Defendants, would become members of a swarm with Defendant.
- 57. 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 Work that are original.
- 58. Indeed, each Defendant directly participated in and therefore materially contributed to each other Defendant's infringing activities.
- 59. Each of the Defendants' contributory infringements were committed "willfully" within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).
- 60. 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.

commerce of the mark EUROCREME, and/or variations thereof, is likely to cause confusion, mistake or deception of consumers as to the source or origin of Plaintiff's goods, services or commercial activities, or lead consumers to mistakenly believe that Plaintiff sponsors, approves of or is affiliated with any of the Defendants or their goods, services or commercial activities.

- 64. As a result of each of the Defendant's infringements, consumers are likely to purchase Defendants' goods or services, or patronize Defendants' commercial activities, mistakenly believing them to be those of the Plaintiff.
- 65. Plaintiff cannot control the nature and quality of the goods, services or commercial activities offered by each of the Defendants, and any failure, neglect or default by each of the Defendants in providing same will and does reflect adversely on Plaintiff as their believed source or origin, thus hampering efforts by Plaintiff to protect its reputation, and resulting in loss of sales, a diminution in Plaintiff's reputation, and/or the need for considerable expenditures to promote its goods, services or commercial activities under its marks, all to the irreparable harm of Plaintiff.
- 66. Plaintiff's damages are continuing, and additional injury and damage to Plaintiff will continue to occur so long as each of the Defendant's above alleged unauthorized and infringing uses persist.
- 67. Each of the Defendants' infringements is willful and deliberate, has resulted in gains, profits and advantages to each of the Defendants, and is designed.

  Case No.

- Plaintiff's damages are continuing, and additional injury and damage to Plaintiff will continue to occur so long as each of the Defendant's above alleged
- Each of the Defendant's contributory infringements is willful and deliberate, has resulted in gains, profits and advantages to each of the Defendants, and is designed specifically to trade upon the goodwill associated with the
  - Plaintiff does not have an adequate remedy at law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

- Permanently enjoin each Defendant and all other persons who are in active concert or participation with each Defendant from continuing their unauthorized and misleading use of Plaintiff's trademark;
- Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the torrent file relating to Plaintiff's trademark from each of the computers under each such
- Order that each Defendant delete and permanently remove the copy of the Work each Defendant has on the computers under Defendant's possession,
- Find that each Defendant is jointly and severally liable for the unauthorized and misleading use of each other Defendant;
  - Award Plaintiff damages, and its attorneys' fees and costs incurred in (E) Case No.

this action; and Grant Plaintiff any other and further relief this Court deems just and (F) proper. **DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL** Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable. Respectfully submitted, By: /s/ Adam M. Silverstein Adam M. Silverstein (197638) CAVALLUZZI & CAVALLUZZI 9200 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 807 Los Angeles, California 90069 Telephone: (310) 246-2601 Facsimile: (310) 246-2606 Email: adam@cavalluzzi.com Attorneys for Plaintiff Case No.

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

# Case 3:12-cv-00368-WQH-VHS COCKER SHE Eiled 02/10/12 Page 20 of 20

The JS 44 civil cover sheet 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 in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docker sheet. TSHE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)	DEFENDANTS	4.4	th date (1)	
RAW FILMS, LTD.		JOHN DOES 1-	11		
131 7	e of First Listed Plaintiff EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	NOTE: IN LAN	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.  Attorneys (If Known)  12 CV0368 WQHNLS		
	e, Address, and Telephone Number) , 9200 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 807, Lt -2601	Attorneys (If Known)			
II. BASIS OF JURISI		III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIFS	Place an "Y" in One Boy for Plaintiff	
7 I U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only)	FF DEF  1 J 1 Incorporated or Pr  of Business In Thi	and One Box for Defendant)  PTF DEF incipal Place	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2 2 Incorporated and I of Business In A		
		Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	<b>□</b> 6 <b>□</b> 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgmen □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Exel. 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 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability 330 Federal Employers Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 380 Other Fraud Property Damage Product Liability 385 Property Damage	Georgia   Geor	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 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	tate Court Appellate Court	Reopened another (speci			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you ar 17 U.S.C. Section 106  Brief description of cause: Copyright Infringement	e filing (Do not cite jurisdictions	al statutes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$ 50,000.00	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF RECORD	<del>_</del>		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT #	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUI	DGE.	