1 2 3 4 5 6	Marc Randazza, SBN 269535 RANDAZZA LEGAL GROUP 3969 Fourth Avenue, Suite 204 San Diego, CA 92103 888-667-1113 305-437-7662 (fax) MJR@Randazza.com Attorney for Plaintiff, LIBERTY MEDIA HOLDINGS, LLC					
7						
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CA	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO DIVISION				
10	LIBERTY MEDIA HOLDINGS, LLC) Case No.	'11CV0575 MMANLS			
11 12	Plaintiff,))				
13	vs.) COMPLAINT				
14	DOES 1 through 62,	 (1) DIRECT COPYRIGHT) INFRINGEMENT – 17 U.S.C. § 501 (2) CONTRIBUTORY COPYRIGHT 				
15	Defendants) INFRINGEMENT) (3) CIVIL CONSPIRACY				
16)				
17		,				
18	Plaintiff, Liberty Media Holdings (h	ereinafter "Lib	erty" or the "Plaintiff") files this			
19	complaint against multiple unknown Defendar	nts and alleges a	s follows:			
20	<u>I. NATURE</u>	E OF THE CAS	<u>SE</u>			
2122	1. Plaintiff is the registered owner	er of the copyri	ght to a motion picture, "Down on			
23	the Farm (hereinafter the "Motion Picture"). A true and correct copy of the Certificate of					
24	Registration for the Motion Picture is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.					
25	ŕ	2. Defendants, whose true identities are currently unknown, acted in a collective and				
26	interdependant manner in the unlawful reproduction and distribution of Plaintiff's Motion					
27		Picture using BitTorrent technology.				
28		•	outes a free copy of Plaintiff's			
	copyrighted Motion Picture to others over the					
	can then distribute that unlawful copy of the Motion Picture to others without degradation in					
		Complaint				

sound or picture quality. Thus, a Defendant's distribution of even a single unlawful copy of the Motion Picture can result in the nearly instantaneous worldwide distribution of that single copy to a limitless number of people. In this case, each Defendant's copyright infringement built upon the prior infringements, in a cascade of infringement.

4. Plaintiff seeks redress for the Defendants' rampant infringement of its exclusive rights in the Motion Picture, and for injunctive relief to stop Defendants from continuing to infringe upon Plaintiff's copyrighted works.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims for copyright infringement and related claims pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §§ 101, et. seq., and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).
- 6. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants, as Defendants either reside in, solicit, transact, or are doing business within the Jurisdiction; they have committed to unlawful and tortious acts both within and outside the Jurisdiction with the full knowledge that their acts would cause injury in this Jurisdiction.
- 7. Each of the Plaintiff's motion pictures, including the Motion Picture at issue in this case, clearly states that it is produced by a California business. Therefore, all Defendants knew full well that infringement upon the copyright in the Motion Picture would cause harm and damage to a California entity.
- 8. Plaintiff's claims arise out of the Defendants' conduct which gives rise to personal jurisdiction over Defendants.
- 9. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(2) and 1400(a). Although the true identities of each and every member of the collective formed by the Defendants is unknown to the Plaintiff at this time, on information and belief, each Defendant may be found in this District and/or a substantial part of the infringing acts complained of herein occurred in this District, and Defendants can reasonably anticipate being haled into court in this District.

III. THE PARTIES

A. The Plaintiff, Liberty Media Holdings, LLC

10. Liberty is a California LLC with a mailing address of 302 Washington Street, Suite 321, San Diego, CA 92103.

B. The Defendants

- 11. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, of defendants John Doe 1-62 are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff knows each Defendant only by the Internet Protocol ("IP") address assigned to the account used by the Defendant at by the account holder's Internet Service Provider ("ISP") on the date and at the time at which the infringing activity of each Defendant was observed. The IP address used by each Defendant thus far identified, together with the date and time at which his or her infringing activity was observed is listed below.
- 12. Plaintiff intends to subpoen the Internet Service Provider (ISP) that issued the Defendants' IP addresses in order to learn the identity of the account holders for the below IP addresses. In most cases, the account holder will be the proper defendant in this case. However, further discovery may be necessary in some circumstances in order to be certain of the identity of the proper defendant.
- 13. The Defendants are a group of BitTorrent users or peers whose computers are collectively interconnected for the sharing of a particular unique file, otherwise known as a "swarm". The particular file a BitTorrent swarm is associated with has a unique "hash" (a file identifier generated by an algorithm developed and implemented by the National Security Agency).
- 14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the Defendants, was and is the agent of the other Defendants, acting within the purpose and scope of said agency. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the Defendants, authorized and ratified the conduct herein alleged of each of the other Defendants.
- 15. Plaintiff believes that information obtained in discovery will lead to the identification of each Defendants' true names and permit the Plaintiff to amend this Complaint to

 state the same. Plaintiff further believes that the information obtained in discovery may lead to the identification of additional infringing parties to be added to this Complaint as defendants. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to include their proper names and capacities when they have been determined. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named Defendants participated in and are responsible for the acts described in this Complaint and damage resulting therefrom.

- 16. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that each of the Defendants named herein performed, participated in, or abetted in some manner, the acts alleged herein, proximately caused the damages alleged and are liable to Plaintiff for the damages and relief sought herein.
- 17. Each of the fictitiously named defendants engaged in their copyright infringement scheme together. They all used the same torrent-sharing website to coordinate their copyright theft; and they all shared and republished the same Motion Picture, and thus are collectively participated in the same swarm sharing the same hash file on the same date.

Defendant Doe 1

- 18. Defendant Doe 1 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 208.59.124.133.
- 19. Doe 1 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the Internet.
 - 20. The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 4:46:30 p.m. UTC.
- 21. As Doe 1 was the first one detected as having distributed the Motion Picture, Doe 1 is, on information and belief, the initial propagator in the Bit Torrent swarm making up the substance of this complaint.

Defendant Doe 2

- 22. Defendant Doe 2 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 72.229.124.39.
- 23. Doe 2 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the Internet.

1	24.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 4:47:27 p.m. UTC, 57	
2	seconds after Doe 1.		
3		Defendant Doe 3	
4	25.	Defendant Doe 3 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 71.170.23.18.	
5	26.	Doe 3 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
6	Plaintiff's co	pyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the	
7	Internet.		
8	27.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 4:48:29 p.m. UTC, 59	
9	seconds after	Doe 2.	
10		Defendant Doe 4	
11	28.	Defendant Doe 4 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 24.90.215.80.	
12	29.	Doe 4 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
13	Plaintiff's cop	pyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the	
۱4	Internet.		
15	30.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 4:53:37 p.m. UTC, 5	
16	minutes and 8	seconds after Doe 3.	
17		<u>Defendant Doe 5</u>	
8	31.	Defendant Doe 5 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 63.226.224.37.	
9	32.	Doe 5 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
20	Plaintiff's cop	pyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the	
21	Internet.		
22	33.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 5:08:41 p.m. UTC, 15	
23	minutes and 4	seconds after Doe 4.	
24		<u>Defendant Doe 6</u>	
25	34.	Defendant Doe 6 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 74.777.199.211.	
26	35.	Doe 6 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
27	Plaintiff's cop	byrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the	
28	Internet.		

1	36.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 5:23:02 p.m. UTC, 14	
2		minutes and 21 seconds after Doe 5.	
3	Defendant Doe 7		
4	37.	Defendant Doe 7 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 96.25.191.194.	
5	38.	Doe 7 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
6	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the		
7	Internet.		
8	39.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 5:26:28 p.m. UTC, 3	
9	minutes and	26 seconds after Doe 6.	
10		Defendant Doe 8	
11	40.	Defendant Doe 8 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 68.83.25.232.	
12	41.	Doe 8 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
13	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the		
14	Internet.		
15	42.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 5:36:21 p.m. UTC, 9	
16	minutes and 53 seconds after Doe 7.		
17		Defendant Doe 9	
18	43.	Defendant Doe 9 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 108.14.252.21.	
19	44.	Doe 9 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
20	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the		
21	Internet.		
22	45.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 5:36:26 p.m. UTC. 5	
23	seconds after	Doe 8.	
24		<u>Defendant Doe 10</u>	
25	46.	Defendant Doe 10 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 184.88.0.196.	
26	47.	Doe 10 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
27	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the		
28	Internet.		

1	48.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 5:37:39 p.m. UTC, 1	
2	minute and 13 seconds after Doe 9.		
3			
4		Defendant Doe 11	
5	49.	Defendant Doe 11 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 76.93.188.92.	
6	50.	Doe 11 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
7	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the		
8	Internet.		
9	51.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 5:49:38 p.m. UTC, 11	
10	minutes and 59 seconds after Doe 10.		
11		Defendant Doe 12	
12	52.	Defendant Doe 12 is unknown, but used the following IP address:	
13			
14	53.	Doe 12 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
15	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the		
16	Internet.		
17	54.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 5:53:41 p.m. UTC, 4	
18	minutes and 3 seconds after Doe 11.		
19		Defendant Doe 13	
20	55.	Defendant Doe 13 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 24.21.220.93.	
21	56.	Doe 13 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the	
22	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the		
23	Internet.		
24	57.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 6:08:20 p.m. UTC, 14	
25	minutes and 39 seconds after Doe 12.		
26		Defendant Doe 14	
27	58.	Defendant Doe 14 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 75.170.158.31.	
28			

seconds after Doe 16.

28

1 **Defendant Doe 18** 2 70. Defendant Doe 18 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 98.204.140.27. 3 71. Doe 18 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the 4 5 Internet. 6 72. The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 6:09:17 p.m. UTC, 2 7 seconds after Doe 17. 8 **Defendant Doe 19** 9 73. Defendant Doe 19 is unknown, but used the following IP 10 76.181.109.245. Doe 19 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the 11 74. Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the 12 13 Internet. 14 75. The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 6:38:15 p.m. UTC, 28 15 minutes and 58 seconds after Doe 18. 16 **Defendant Doe 20** 17 76. Defendant Doe 20 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 76.89.101.186. 77. Doe 20 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the 18 Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the 19 20 Internet. 21 78. The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 6:38:29 p.m. UTC, 14 22 seconds after Doe 19. 23 **Defendant Doe 21** 24 79. Defendant Doe 21 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 25 98.113.165.250. 26 80. Doe 21 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the 27 28 Internet.

1	81.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 6:38:45 p.m. UTC, 16
2	seconds after	
3		Defendant Doe 22
4	82.	Defendant Doe 22 is unknown, but used the following IP address:
5	67.185.111.1	
6	83.	Doe 22 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the
7	Plaintiff's co	opyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the
8	Internet.	
9	84.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 6:40:11 p.m. UTC, 1
10	minute and 2	6 seconds after Doe 21.
11		Defendant Doe 23
12	85.	Defendant Doe 23 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 66.61.118.150.
13	86.	Doe 23 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the
14	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the	
15	Internet.	
16	87.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 7:07:48 p.m. UTC, 27
17	minutes and 3	37 seconds after Doe 22.
18		Defendant Doe 24
19	88.	Defendant Doe 24 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 67.167.202.91.
20	89.	Doe 24 used this I.P. address to illegally republish and illegally distribute the
21	Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture to an unknown number of other individuals over the	
22	Internet.	
23	90.	The infringing activity took place on November 15, 2010 at 7:07:50 p.m. UTC, 2
24	seconds after	Doe 23.
25		<u>Defendant Doe 25</u>
26	91.	Defendant Doe 25 is unknown, but used the following IP address:
27	76.121.105.2	55.
28		

173.49.206.237.

Defendant Doe 33 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 67.161.126.94.

115.

Defendant Doe 37 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 174.109.25.25.

address:

15 Complaint

Defendant Doe 45 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 208.120.17.45.

151.

Defendant Doe 49 is unknown, but used the following IP address: 68.35.186.54.

28

163.

17 Complaint

Defendant Doe 57

28

minute and 12 seconds after Doe 59.

process, a tracker directs a BitTorrent user's computer to other users who have a particular file, and then facilitates the download process from those users.

- 206. For a BitTorrent user, this process is quite simple. When a BitTorrent user seeks to download a motion picture, he or she merely clicks on the appropriate torrent reference file (also known as a ".torrent" file), which may be found online on any number of BitTorrent websites.
- 207. Because BitTorrent clients generally do not have the ability to search for torrents, end-users use search engines or other websites that contain indices of .torrent files (commonly known as "torrent websites") to find files being made available by other BitTorrent users. These torrent files do not contain audio or visual media, but instruct the user's BitTorrent client where to go and how to obtain the desired file.
- 208. The torrent file then instructs the user's BitTorrent software how to connect to a tracker that will identify where the file is available. The end user's BitTorrent software then begins downloading the torrent file without any further effort from the user.
- 209. The life cycle of a torrent file begins with just one individual—the initial propagator. The initial propagator intentionally elects to share a file with a torrent network. The original file contains Plaintiff's entire copyrighted work, referred to as a "seed".
- 210. Other members of the swarm connect to the seed file to download the file, wherein the download creates an exact digital copy of Plaintiff's copyrighted work on the downloaders computer. As additional peers request the same file, each additional user joins the collective network, and each new file downloader receives a different piece of the data from each host user in the swarm who has already downloaded the file that together comprises the whole. The BitTorrent technology requires that every downloader must also be an uploader of the infringing material. This means that every "node" or peer user who has a copy of the infringing copyrighted material on a torrent network must also be a source of the download for that infringing file.
- 211. Files downloaded in this method are received in hundreds or even thousands of individual pieces. Each piece that is downloaded is immediately thereafter made available for distribution to other users seeking the same complete file. The effect of this technology makes

every downloader also an uploader of the content. This means that every user who has a copy of the infringing material on a torrent network must necessarily also be a source for later downloaders of that material.

- 212. In the BitTorrent world, there is honor among thieves. Those who merely download files, without publishing and sharing files, are derisively called "leechers."
- 213. Being a lecher is not only a negative due to the pejorative terminology, leechears are punished by the torrent swarm.
- 214. BitTorrent's protocol stalls the downloads of leechers, in an effort to preserve network speed for the more prolific copyright infringers. The sharing of files as users receive them, then, is inherent in BitTorrent's use for the protocol to be of any utility to the end user.
- 215. This distributed nature of BitTorrent leads to a rapid viral sharing of a file throughout the collective peer users. As more peers join the collective swarm, the frequency of successful downloads also increases. Because of the nature of BitTorrent protocol, any seed peer that has downloaded a file prior the time a subsequent peer downloads the same file is automatically a source for the subsequent peer so long as that first peer is online at the time the subsequent peer downloads a file. Because of the nature of the collective swarm downloads as articulated above, every infringer is and by necessity together simultaneously stealing the Plaintiff's copyrighted material.
- 216. Plaintiff has recorded each Defendant herein publishing the Motion Picture via BitTorrent.
- 217. Plaintiff's Motion Picture is easily discernable as a professional work. Plaintiff created the works using professional performers, directors, cinematographers, lighting technicians, set designers and editors. Plaintiff created each work with professional-grade cameras, lighting, and editing equipment.
- 218. Each of Plaintiff's works is marked with Plaintiff's trademark (CORBIN FISHER®), a copyright notice, a warning that unauthorized copying is illegal and will be prosecuted, and a statement as required by 18 U.S.C. §2257 that age verification records for all individuals appearing in the works are maintained at corporate offices in San Diego, California.

219. At various times, Plaintiff discovered and documented a its copyrighted work being publicly distributed by Does 1-62 by and through the BitTorrent network.

220. Defendants, without authorization, copied and distributed audiovisual works owned by and registered to Plaintiff.

V. DEFENDANTS ARE MEMBERS OF A SINGLE BITTORRENT SWARM

- 221. Defendants are peer members who have all collectively participated in the same peer-to-peer (hereinafter, "P2P") network swarm that was utilized to unlawfully infringe upon Plaintiff's exclusive rights in its copyrighted film without permission.
- 222. Defendants initiated their infringing conduct by accessing a BitTorrent website known for possession a large catalogue of adult films.
- 223. Defendants each then obtained a .torrent file for Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture from the video catalogue of the BitTorrent website and downloaded that .torrent file into a computer program developed to read such files. The unique file identifier generated by an algorithm developed by the National Security Agency associated with the instant action is A3E6F65F2E3D672400A5908F64ED55B66A0880B8 (hereinafter, the "Hash"). Each Defendant is a member of the same collective associated with the aforementioned hash, and each acted collectively, and in concert, in effectuating the illegal and unauthorized sharing of Plaintiff's copyrighted work.
- 224. Each Defendant peer owns or otherwise has control of a different computer collectively connected to the Internet that contained or possibly still contains a .torrent file containing at least a portion of Plaintiff's copyright work.
- All of the defendants republished and duplicated the Plaintiff's Motion Picture. Moreover, they did not only replicate the same motion picture, but all of the defendants, as members of the same swarm, republished, duplicated, and replicated the precise same copy and same Hash version of the motion picture, thus demonstrating that all of the defendants shared and replicated the same motion picture with one another, thus linking them all together in a massive conspiracy and concerted effort to deprive the Plaintiff of its exclusive rights in the Motion Picture under the Copyright Act.

6 7

9 10

8

12

13

11

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

- 226. Defendant peers each utilized a .torrent file to upload and download Plaintiff's copyrighted film without permission through a BitTorrent protocol.
- Each Defendant peer, consistent with using a BitTorrent P2P network, created a 227. torrent file of Plaintiff's Motion Picture.
- After each Defendant peer downloaded a torrent containing Plaintiff's 228. copyrighted Motion Picture, each Defendant uploaded their torrent onto a BitTorrent site for the purpose of sharing Plaintiff's copyrighted work with other members of the BitTorrent collective network.
- Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture was then uploaded and downloaded 229. through a single swarm collective among the various Defendants in concert - all members sharing the same exact video, using the same exact hash file.
- Once uploaded to the BitTorrent site, the Defendant peers shared the Plaintiff's 230. copyrighted Motion Picture as participants in a unique single swarm. More precisely, the BitTorrent network divided the original copyrighted work into many small pieces and distributed these pieces throughout the swarm until each of the collectively participating Defendants in the swarm had a partial or complete infringing copy of the Motion Picture.
- 231. Based on this information, Defendants all participated in the same collective swarm, infringing upon Plaintiff's exclusive rights in its work by uploading (distributing) and downloading (reproducing) Plaintiff's copyrighted film, and through their actions each Defendant assisted each and every other Defendant, each members of the P2P network swarm, to illegally download Plaintiff's copyrighted work.

VI. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Copyright Infringement 17 U.S.C. § 501)

- The Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in 232. each paragraph above.
- Plaintiff is, and at all relevant times has been, the copyright owner of the 233. copyrighted work infringed upon by all Defendants, "Down on the Farm." Exh. 1.

- 234. Among the exclusive rights granted to each Plaintiff under the Copyright Act are the exclusive rights to reproduce the Motion Picture and to distribute it—rights which Defendants maliciously and intentionally infringed upon.
- 235. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants without the permission or consent of Plaintiff, have used, and continue to use, the BitTorrent online media distribution system to distribute the Motion Picture to the public, and/or make the Motion Picture available for distribution to others, including other BitTorrent users. In doing so, Defendants have violated Plaintiff's exclusive rights of reproduction and distribution. Defendants' actions constitute infringement of Plaintiff's copyrights and exclusive rights under the Copyright Act.
- 236. Plaintiff is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the foregoing acts of infringement were willful and intentional.
- 237. As a result of Defendants' infringement of Plaintiff's copyrights and exclusive rights under the Copyright Act, Plaintiff is entitled to either actual or statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c), and to its attorney fees pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.
- 238. The conduct of Defendants is causing and will continue to cause Plaintiff great and irreparable injury. Such harm will continue unless the Defendants are enjoined from such conduct by this Honorable Court. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §§ 502 and 503, Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief prohibited Defendant from further infringing Plaintiff's copyrights, and ordering Defendant to destroy all copies of the Works made in violation of Plaintiff's exclusive copyright rights.

VII. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION (CONTRIBUTORY COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT)

- 239. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in each paragraph above.
- 240. It is helpful to think of the process of "torrenting" in the context of a constructed puzzle. In furtherance of sharing this puzzle, it is deconstructed into tiny pieces called "bits." These bits are then uploaded and distributed onto the torrent-sharing site. When an infringer downloads the file, he downloads one of the distributed bits of the file. This file is capable of

locating all the other unique corresponding bits to which it was originally attached- the 'hash'. Once all the bits are located and downloaded they are reconstructed back into the original order completing the entire original copyrighted file.

- 241. When users all possess the same infringing work with the same exact hash file (as in this case), it is because each infringer possesses an exact digital copy, containing the exact bits unique to that file, of the original work. In essence, although hundred of users may be uploading the copyrighted work, you will receive only the exact parts of a singular upload, not a compilation of available bits from various uploads.
- 242. Each of the Defendants published the precise same "hash" file, described in Paragraph 223, to the BitTorrent network.
- 243. Each Defendant downloaded, uploaded and distributed the motion picture to each other, in concert with one another and through use of the exact same site and protocol.
- 244. Because it is the exact same motion picture, using the exact same hash, in the same general timeframe, the transaction of events at issue in this Complaint is common to all Defendants, thus rendering the Defendants properly joined in this action.
- 245. BitTorrent users upload infringing works in concert in order to gain access and ability to download other infringing copyrighted works.
- 246. As each of the thousands of people who illegally downloaded the movie accessed this illegal publication, they derived portions of their illegal replication of the file from multiple persons, including but not limited to the Defendants named in this action.
- 247. The Defendants knew of the infringement, were conscious of their own infringement, and the Defendants were conscious of the fact that multiple other persons derivatively downloaded the file containing the Plaintiff's Motion Picture.
- 248. The infringement by other BitTorrent users could not have occurred but for the Defendant's participation in uploading the Plaintiffs protected work. As such, the Defendants participation in the infringing activities of others is substantial.
- 249. The Defendants each profited from this contributory infringement by way of being granted access to a greater library of other infringing works, some of which belonged to the Plaintiff and some of which belonged to other copyright owners.

VIII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(CIVIL CONSPIRACY)

- 250. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in each paragraph above.
- 251. Without authorization, each of the Jon Doe Defendants uploaded and distributed Plaintiff's copyrighted works by and through the BitTorrent Network.
- 252. The BitTorrent Network is used almost exclusively to locate, reproduce, and distribute infringing content.
- 253. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that the material available by and through the BitTorrent network includes a substantial amount of obviously unauthorized material including, for example, first run feature films prior to DVD or even box office release.
- 254. In order to access and use the BitTorrent network, a user must first download special software called a BitTorrent client.
- 255. The center of the conspiracy is the scheme to traffic in infringing content. If authorities remove any of the BitTorrent servers from service, the others may continue to operate.
- 256. The purpose of the BitTorrent Network (i.e. for certain participants to establish a central hub of indexing servers to facilitate the reproduction and distribution of infringing copies of copyrighted works between a network of coconspirators) is apparent to any user who downloads a BitTorrent client and uses the client for that purpose.
- 257. Once a user identifies and selects the infringing content he wants to download, he or she can then use the BitTorrent client to instruct the software residing on BitTorrent servers to locate that file on the computers of other users offering the file for distribution and then transfer the infringing file to his computer. The software on the BitTorrent servers then locates the file on various users' computers and transfers pieces of the file to the user who searched for the file and ordered the transfer.
- 258. The transfer of infringing files cannot occur without the existence and assistance of the BitTorrent servers at the hub of the system that house the index of infringing files and

facilitates the transfer of various bits of the infringing files from one user to another. Nor can the system work without the participant users who supply the infringing content.

- 259. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the Defendants downloaded the BitTorrent client for the purpose of conspiring with other BitTorrent users to reproduce and distribute movies in violation of copyright laws.
- 260. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that at the time each Doe Defendant downloaded BitTorrent client, he knew the client would provide access to infringing movies made available by other users and would allow the Defendant to provide infringing movies to other BitTorrent users.
- 261. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at the time each Doe Defendant downloaded the BitTorrent client, he intended to access the BitTorrent network for the purpose of reproducing and exchanging infringing copies of movies in violation of copyright laws.
- 262. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that BitTorrent clients reward users for making content available to others by enabling faster download speeds for those who make content available.
- 263. In addition to the infringing files of Plaintiff's movies, each identified Doe without authorization offered large amounts of infringing content belonging to other copyright holders for others to download, knowing the infringing nature of the content they offered.
- 264. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each Defendant without authorization offered large amounts of infringing content to others, knowing that other BitTorrent users would download the infringing content and further distribute it in exchange for still more infringing content.
- 265. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each Defendant distributed infringing movies in anticipation of receiving copies of infringing movies in return.
- 266. Each Doe Defendant knew or should have known that the infringing content the Defendant downloaded to his computer came from the computers of other users, who made the content available to him and others on the BitTorrent network, in violation of copyright laws.

- 267. The operators of the BitTorrent servers form the hub of a rimless wheel conspiracy to reproduce and distribute content without the copyright holders' authorization and without regard to copyright laws.
- 268. Each Doe Defendant understood the nature of the conspiracy to violate copyrights and agreed to join the conspiracy by downloading the BitTorrent client with the intention of using that BitTorrent client to knowingly download, reproduce, and distribute infringing files with coconspirators.
- 269. Each Defendant engaged in an unlawful act in furtherance of the conspiracy when he, without authorization, used the BitTorrent client to download, reproduce, and distribute copies of Plaintiff's copyright registered works.
- 270. Defendants, all and each of them, conspired with the other Defendants by agreeing to provide infringing reproductions of various copyright protected works, including Plaintiff's works, in exchange for infringing reproductions of other copyright protected works, including Plaintiff's works.
- 271. Each Defendant took affirmative steps to advance the conspiracy by unlawfully and without authorization reproducing Plaintiff's copyrighted works and distributing those works to coconspirators by and through the BitTorrent network in anticipation of receiving other infringing copies of copyright protected works in exchange.
- 272. The Defendants' conspiracy with others to unlawfully reproduce and distribution infringing copies of its works by and through the BitTorrent Network caused Plaintiff harm in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 273. Each Defendant is jointly and severally liable for the harm Plaintiff suffered as a result of the Defendants participation in the conspiracy to violate copyright laws.

IX. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(NEGLIGENCE)

- 274. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in each paragraph above.
- 275. Defendants accessed, or controlled access, to the Internet connection used in performing the unauthorized copying and sharing of Plaintiff's Motion Picture described above.

276. Defendants failed to adequately secure their internet access, whether accessible only through their computer when physically connected to an internet router, or accessible to many computers by use of a wireless router, and prevent its use for this unlawful purpose.

- 277. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants' failure to secure their internet access allowed for the copying and sharing of Plaintiff's Motion Picture by use of the BitTorrent protocol on Defendants' respective internet connections, and interfering with Plaintiff's exclusive rights in the copyrighted work.
- 278. By virtue of this unsecured access, Defendants negligently allowed the use of their internet access accounts to perform the above-described copying and sharing of Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture.
- 279. Had Defendants taken reasonable care in securing access to their Internet connections, such infringements as those described above would not have occurred by the use of their Internet access accounts.
- 280. Defendants' negligent actions allowed others to unlawfully copy and share Plaintiff's copyrighted Motion Picture, causing financial harm to Plaintiff and unlawfully interfering with Plaintiff's exclusive rights in the Motion Picture.

PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR RELIEF

1. For an injunction providing:

Defendant shall be and hereby is enjoined from directly or indirectly infringing upon the Plaintiff's copyrights in the works listed in Exhibit A or any other works, whether now in existence or later created, that are owned or controlled by Plaintiff (or any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of Plaintiff), including without limitation by using the Internet or any online media distribution system to reproduce (i.e. download) any of Plaintiff's works, to distribute (i.e. upload) any of Plaintiff's works, or to make any of Plaintiff's works available for distribution to the public, except pursuant to a lawful license or with the Plaintiff's express authority. Defendant also shall destroy all copies of Plaintiff's works that Defendant has downloaded onto any computer hard drive or server and shall destroy all copies of those downloaded works transferred onto any physical medium or device in Defendant's possession, custody, or control.

2. For damages for each infringement of each copyrighted work pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504. These damages may be actual or statutory, but if statutory damages are elected,

the Defendants' acts were willful in nature, justifying an award of up to \$150,000 per infringement, and Plaintiff reserves the right to make such an election.

- 3. For Plaintiff's costs in this action.
- 4. For Plaintiff's attorney's fees incurred in bringing this action.
- 5. For such other and further relief, either at law or in equity, general or special, to which the may be entitled.

Date: March 22, 2011.

s/ Marc Randazza
Marc Randazza, SBN269535
Randazza Legal Group
MJR@randazza.com
3969 Fourth Ave., Suite 204
San Diego, CA 92103
888-667-1113
305-437-7662 (fax)