

1 Brett L. Gibbs, Esq. (SBN 251000)  
Steele Hansmeier PLLC  
2 38 Miller Avenue, #263  
Mill Valley, CA 94941  
3 415-341-5318  
[blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com](mailto:blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com)

4 *Attorney for Plaintiff*  
5

6  
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 FIRST TIME VIDEOS, LLC, ) **No.**  
11 ) **Judge:**  
12 Plaintiff, )  
13 v. )  
14 DOES 1-37 ) **COMPLAINT**  
15 Defendants. ) **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

16  
17 **COMPLAINT**

18 NOW COMES Plaintiff First Time Videos, LLC, (“FTV” or “Plaintiff”) by and through its  
19 undersigned counsel, and complains and alleges as follows:

20 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

21 1. This action is reactionary. Plaintiff brings this civil action under the United States  
22 Copyright Act and its related conspiracy claim to combat the Doe Defendants’ intentional  
23 infringement of Plaintiff’s copyrighted creative works. The Doe Defendants, whose names Plaintiff  
24 expects to ascertain during expedited discovery, illegally reproduced and distributed Plaintiff’s  
25 copyrighted creative works over an Internet computer network peer-to-peer “sharing” website and,  
26 upon information and belief, continue to do so as of the filing of this suit.  
27  
28

1           2.       Per N.D. Cal. Local Rule 3-5, this Court has federal subject matter jurisdiction over  
2 the copyright infringement claim under 17 U.S.C. §§ 101, *et seq.*, (commonly referred to as “the  
3 Copyright Act”), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (granting federal courts federal question jurisdiction over civil  
4 actions arising under the laws of the United States), and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) (granting federal courts  
5 original jurisdiction over any Congressional acts relating to copyrights). This Court has  
6 supplemental jurisdiction over the civil conspiracy claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because it is  
7 directly related to Plaintiff’s copyright infringement claim, which is within this Court’s original  
8 jurisdiction, such that the two claims form part of the same case and controversy under Article III of  
9 the United States Constitution.  
10

11           3.       This Court has personal jurisdiction over all of the parties because, upon credible  
12 information and belief gathered by Plaintiff, all the Doe Defendants either reside or committed  
13 copyright infringement in the State of California. Plaintiff used geolocation technology to trace the  
14 IP addresses of each Doe Defendant to a point of origin within the State of California. This Court  
15 also has personal jurisdiction over non-resident Defendants under the California long-arm statute,  
16 California Code of Civil Procedure § 410.10, because they downloaded copyrighted content from, or  
17 uploaded it to, California residents, and thus committed copyright infringement in and through this  
18 State, and engaged in a civil conspiracy to commit copyright infringement with California residents.  
19  
20 (*See also* Federal Rule of Civil Procedure (“FRCP”) 4(k)(1)(A)).  
21

22           4.       Venue is properly founded in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)  
23 and 1400(a) because, on information and belief, Doe Defendants reside in this District, may be found  
24 in this District, and/or committed acts in this District giving rise to Plaintiff’s claims. Per N.D. Cal.  
25 Local Rule 3-2(c), this intellectual property action is exempt from these venue requirements.  
26

27           5.       Joinder of Defendants is proper for just adjudication because all Defendants  
28 participated in a civil conspiracy to commit copyright infringement, which comprised of a series of

1 transactions that ultimately ended in the Doe Defendants' illicit distribution of Plaintiff's unique  
2 Work amongst one another. The series of transactions in this case involved exchanging pieces of the  
3 Work's file over the Internet amongst Doe Defendants with each Doe Defendant sharing pieces of  
4 Plaintiff's copyrighted file with each other (otherwise known as "torrent swarming") to obtain a  
5 complete copy of Plaintiff's Work. The nature of the BitTorrent distribution protocol necessitates a  
6 concerted action by many people in order to disseminate files, such as Plaintiff's Work. Due to  
7 BitTorrent's setup and this concerted action, it is impossible for individuals to the simply download  
8 files on BitTorrent without the active participation of others. Doe Defendants in this case, in order  
9 to download Plaintiff's Work, intentionally engaged in this concerted action with other Doe  
10 Defendants and other yet unnamed individuals on BitTorrent by entering the torrent swarm. The  
11 Doe Defendants are properly joined even if they were not engaged in a contemporaneous swarm  
12 because they have contributed to the chain of data distribution due to their prior involvement in like  
13 swarms. Doe Defendants also share the same questions of law with respect to their copyright  
14 infringement, including, but not limited to:

- 17 (A) Whether Plaintiff is the exclusive licensee of the copyrighted works at issue;  
18 (B) Whether "copying" has occurred within the meaning of the Copyright Act;  
19 (C) Whether entering a "torrent swarm" constitutes a willful act of infringement;  
20 (D) Whether entering a "torrent swarm" constitutes a civil conspiracy; and  
21 (E) Whether, and to what extent, Plaintiff has been damaged by the Doe Defendants'  
22 conduct.  
23

24 All of these questions should be answered as part of a single suit for all of the reasons outlined by  
25 FRCP 19(a). Such joinder is mandated if "feasible." Such joinder is entirely "feasible" in this case.

26 //

27 //

28

**PARTIES**

1  
2 6. Plaintiff is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the  
3 State of Nevada. FTV is a prominent producer of adult content within a variety of adult  
4 entertainment niches. FTV's flagship site, ftvgirls.com, features over 2,500 videos and over 100,000  
5 high resolution photographs. Well known for high production values and regular site updates, FTV  
6 invests substantial capital in producing its content, and in particular its FTV Girls series of content.  
7

8 7. The unique copyrighted work at issue in this case is an adult video entitled FTV Girls  
9 - Ella (hereinafter "Work").

10 8. Doe Defendants' actual names are unknown and unascertainable to Plaintiff. Instead,  
11 Plaintiff knows each Doe Defendant only by an Internet Protocol address (hereinafter "IP address"),  
12 which is a number assigned to devices, such as computers, connected to the Internet by an Internet  
13 Service Provider (hereinafter "ISP"). In the course of monitoring Internet-based infringement of its  
14 copyrighted content, Plaintiff's agents observed unlawful reproduction and distribution occurring  
15 among IP addresses listed on Exhibit A, attached hereto, via the BitTorrent Internet protocol, an  
16 Internet website allowing for "peer-to-peer" (hereinafter "P2P") data exchanging. Plaintiff believes  
17 that the Defendants' identities will be revealed through expedited discovery, at which time Plaintiff  
18 will seek leave of the Court to amend this Complaint to identify Defendants by name. Further,  
19 Plaintiff believes that the information gathered in discovery will allow Plaintiff to identify additional  
20 Defendants not listed in the Exhibit A, as infringement monitoring is ongoing.  
21  
22

**BACKGROUND**

23  
24 9. BitTorrent is a modern file sharing method (hereinafter "protocol") used for  
25 distributing data via the Internet.

26 10. Traditional file transfer protocols involve a central server, which distributes data  
27 directly to individual users. This method is prone to collapse when large numbers of users request  
28

1 data from the central server, in which case the server can become overburdened and the rate of data  
2 transmission can slow considerably or cease altogether. In addition, the reliability of access to the  
3 data stored on a server is largely dependent on the server's ability to continue functioning for  
4 prolonged periods of time under high resource demands.

5  
6 11. In contrast, the BitTorrent protocol is a decentralized method of distributing data.  
7 Instead of relying on a central server to distribute data directly to individual users, the BitTorrent  
8 protocol allows individual users to distribute data among themselves by exchanging pieces of the file  
9 with each other to eventually obtain a whole copy of the file. When using the BitTorrent protocol,  
10 every user simultaneously receives information from and transfers information to one another.

11  
12 12. In BitTorrent vernacular, individual downloaders/distributors of a particular file are  
13 called peers. The group of peers involved in downloading/distributing a particular file is called a  
14 swarm. A server which stores a list of peers in a swarm is called a tracker. A computer program  
15 that implements the BitTorrent protocol is called a BitTorrent client. Each swarm is unique to a  
16 particular file.

17  
18 13. The BitTorrent protocol operates as follows. First, a user locates a small "torrent"  
19 file. This file contains information about the files to be shared and about the tracker, the computer  
20 that coordinates the file distribution. Second, the user loads the torrent file into a BitTorrent client,  
21 which automatically attempts to connect to the tracker listed in the torrent file. Third, the tracker  
22 responds with a list of peers and the BitTorrent client connects to those peers to begin downloading  
23 data from and distributing data to the other peers in the swarm. When the download is complete, the  
24 BitTorrent client continues distributing data to other peers in the swarm until the user manually  
25 disconnects from the swarm or the BitTorrent client otherwise does the same.

26  
27 14. The degree of anonymity provided by the BitTorrent protocol is extremely low.  
28 Because the protocol is based on peers connecting to one another, a peer must broadcast identifying

1 information (i.e. an IP address) before it can receive data. Nevertheless, the actual names of peers in  
2 a swarm are unknown, as the users are allowed to download and distribute under the cover of their  
3 IP addresses.

4 15. The BitTorrent protocol is an extremely popular method for transferring data. The  
5 size of swarms for popular files can reach into the tens of thousands of unique peers. A swarm will  
6 commonly have peers from many, if not every, state in the United States and several countries  
7 around the world. And every peer in the swarm participates in distributing the file to dozens,  
8 hundreds, or even thousands of other peers.

9 16. The BitTorrent protocol is also an extremely popular method for unlawfully copying,  
10 reproducing, and distributing files in violation of the copyright laws of the United States. A broad  
11 range of copyrighted albums, audiovisual files, photographs, software, and other forms of media are  
12 available for illegal reproduction and distribution via the BitTorrent protocol.

13 17. Efforts at combating BitTorrent-based copyright infringement have been stymied by  
14 BitTorrent's decentralized nature. Because there are no central servers to enjoin from unlawfully  
15 distributing copyrighted content, there is no primary target on which to focus anti-piracy efforts.  
16 Indeed, the same decentralization that makes the BitTorrent protocol an extremely robust and  
17 efficient means of transferring enormous quantities of data also acts to insulate it from anti-piracy  
18 measures.

#### 21 **ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS**

22 18. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff has been the exclusive owner of the distribution  
23 and reproduction rights of the Work at issue in this action.

24 19. Plaintiff is the author of the Work.

25 20. The Work is the subject of a copyright registration application and the application is  
26 currently pending in the United States Copyright Office.  
27



1 28. Doe Defendants' conduct was willful within the meaning of the Copyright Act:  
2 intentional, and with indifference to the Plaintiff's rights. Doe Defendants' active participation on  
3 BitTorrent swarms relating to Plaintiff's Work make this fact abundently clear.

4 29. Plaintiff has been damaged by Doe Defendants' conduct, including but not limited to  
5 economic and reputation losses. Plaintiff continues to be damaged by such conduct, and has no  
6 adequate remedy at law to compensate Plaintiff for all of the past, and possibly future, damages  
7 stemming from the Doe Defendants' conduct. In fact, further irreparable harm to Plaintiff's  
8 copyrights and exclusive rights is imminent without Court intervention. Without restrictions, these  
9 infringers will run rampant.

10 30. Plaintiff hereby reserves the right, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c), to elect to recover  
11 statutory damages for each infringement, in lieu of seeking recovery of actual damages.  
12

13 31. As Defendants' infringement was intentional and willful, the Plaintiff is entitled to an  
14 award of statutory damages, exemplary damages, attorneys' fees, and the costs of the suit.  
15

16 **COUNT II – CIVIL CONSPIRACY**

17 **(California Common Law Tort)**

18 32. Plaintiff hereby incorporates by this reference each and every allegation contained in  
19 the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

20 33. In using the P2P BitTorrent file distribution method, each Doe Defendant participated  
21 in, aided in, attempted to aid in, or at least knew of the formation and operation of a common-plan  
22 conspiracy to unlawfully reproduce and distribute Plaintiff's Work by exchanging pieces of the  
23 Work file in a torrent swarm on BitTorrent.

24 34. Doe Defendants, in participating in said conspiratorial file exchanging network,  
25 agreed to engage in a concerted tortious action with other (currently discovered and undiscovered)  
26 Doe Defendants on the network to reproduce and distribute Plaintiff's Work.  
27



1           3)       That the Court issue injunctive relief against Doe Defendants, enjoing and  
2       restraining the Doe Defendants and all others in active concert with them from further violating  
3       Plaintiff’s copyrighted Works, and further issue an order impounding or requiring Doe Defendants to  
4       destroy all copies of those unlawfully copyrighted files in Doe Defendants’ possession, custody,  
5       and/or control pursuant to 17 U.S.C. §§ 503 & 509(a);  
6

7           4)       That the Court enter a written judgment in favor of the Plaintiff against Defendants  
8       for actual damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(a) or statutory damages up to one-hundred and fifty-  
9       thousand dollars (\$150,000) pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), at the election of Plaintiff, in an amount  
10      to be ascertained at trial;

11          5)       As to Count II, that the Court order Doe Defendants jointly and severally liable to  
12      Plaintiff in the full amount of the Judgment on the basis of a common law claim for civil conspiracy  
13      to commit copyright infringement; and for an award of compensatory damages based on the civil  
14      conspiracy count in favor of the Plaintiff and against Defendants, jointly and severally, in an amount  
15      to be determined at trial;

17 //  
18 //  
19 //  
20 //  
21 //  
22 //  
23 //  
24 //  
25 //  
26 //  
27 //  
28 //

