J. Andrew Coombs (SBN 123881); Annie S. Wang (SBN 243027) J. Andrew Coombs, A P. C. 517 East Wilson Avenue, Suite 202 Glendale, California 91206 Telephone: (818) 500-3200

Facsimile: (818) 500-3201

CV-1A (01/01)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICT OF CALIFORNIA
CV 0-8-00061
(s)
SUMMONS (s)
3):
d to file with this court and serve upon plaintiff's attorney, whose address is:
amended complaint counterclaim cross-claim days after service of this Summons upon you, exclusive ment by default will be taken against you for the relief
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
By: <u>Natalie Longoria</u> Deputy Clerk
(Seal of the Court)
Deputy Clerk /
UMMONS

		FILED				
1	J. Andrew Coombs (SBN 123881) andy@coombspc.com					
2	Annie S. Wang (SBN 243027) annie@coombspc.com	2008 JAN -4 PM 2: 58				
3	J. Andrew Coombs, A P. C. 517 E. Wilson Ave., Suite 202	CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. C. CALIF.				
4	Il Glendale, California 91706	LOS ANGRES				
5	Telephone: (818) 500-3200 Facsimile: (818) 500-3201	BY				
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff Nike, Inc.					
7						
8	UNITED STATES I	DISTRICT COURT				
9	CENTRAL DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA				
10	Nike, Inc.,	Case No - n n n 6 1 F (CWx)				
11	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR TRADEMARK				
12	v.	INFRINGEMENT, TRADEMARK DILUTION AND UNFAIR				
13	Sothearith Chhay, Sophorn Chhay, Steve Chhay, Khemora Chor, Naray Rath and	COMPETITION				
14	Does 1 – 10, inclusive,	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL				
15	Defendants.					
16						
17	Plaintiff Nike, Inc. ("Nike") alleges as follows:					
18	JURISDICTION AND VENUE					
19	1. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the claims in this					
20	action pursuant to the provisions of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051, et seq., 28					
21	U.S.C. § 1338(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims					
22	in this action that arise under the law of the State of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C.					
23	§ 1367(a), because the state law claims are so related to the federal claims that they					
24	form part of the same case or controversy and derive from a common nucleus of					
25	operative facts.					
26	2. Venue is proper in this judicial	district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).				
27	The defendants offered and sold products the	nat are the subject of this litigation in the				
28		_				

-1-

Nike v. Chhay: Complaint

Case 2:08-cv-00061-R-CW Document 1 Filed 01/04/2008 Page 2 of 21

7

10 11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Central District of California. The claims alleged in this action arose in the Central District of California.

INTRODUCTION

- 3. This action has been filed by Nike to combat the willful sale of unlicensed and counterfeit products ("Infringing Product"), specifically including its core product of sports shoes, bearing Nike's exclusive trademarks. Defendants in this action are sellers of counterfeit Nike branded shoes through Internet sites including but not necessarily limited to www.retrosneak.com. www.23retroshoes.com, www.buyretroshoe.com, www.retro23fans.com and www.airjordanshoesonline.com (the "Websites"). Through such active manufacturing, purchasing, distributing, offering of sale and selling such unlicensed and counterfeit footwear, Nike is irreparably damaged through consumer confusion, dilution and tarnishment of its valuable trademarks.
- 4. Nike seeks a permanent injunction, damages, costs and attorney's fees as authorized by the Lanham Act and California law.

THE PARTIES

- 5. Nike is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Oregon having its principal place of business in Beaverton, Oregon. Nike is qualified to do business in the State of California and both directly and through its wholly owned affiliated companies is engaged in a variety of businesses in the City and County of Los Angeles.
- 6. Defendant Sothearith Chhay ("Sothearith Chhay") is an individual resident of the State of California. Upon information and belief, Sothearith Chhay transacts business as retrosneak.com, 23retroshoes.com, buyretroshoe.com, retro23 fans.com and airjordanshoesonline.com, by selling, offering for sale, importing, advertising and distributing the Infringing Product in this judicial district.

27

28

7. Defendant Sophorn Chhay ("Sophorn Chhay") is an individual resident of the State of California. Upon information and belief, Sophorn Chhay transacts business as retrosneak.com, 23retroshoes.com, buyretroshoe.com, retro23fans.com and airjordanshoesonline.com, by selling, offering for sale, importing, advertising and distributing the Infringing Product in this judicial district.

- 8. Defendant Steve Chhay ("Steve Chhay") is an individual resident of the State of California. Upon information and belief, Steve Chhay transacts business as retrosneak.com, 23retroshoes.com, buyretroshoe.com, retro23fans.com and airjordanshoesonline.com, by selling, offering for sale, importing, advertising and distributing the Infringing Product in this judicial district.
- 9. Defendant Khemora Chor ("Chor") is an individual resident of the State of California. Upon information and belief, Chor transacts business as retrosneak.com, 23retroshoes.com, buyretroshoe.com, retro23fans.com and airjordanshoesonline.com, by selling, offering for sale, importing, advertising and distributing the Infringing Product in this judicial district.
- 10. Defendant Naray Rath ("Rath") is an individual resident of the State of California. Upon information and belief, Rath transacts business as retrosneak.com. 23retroshoes.com, buyretroshoe.com, retro23fans.com and airjordanshoesonline.com, by selling, offering for sale, importing, advertising and distributing the Infringing Product in this judicial district.
- Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that 11. defendants John Does 1-10 are entities or individuals who are residents in this judicial district and are subject to the jurisdiction of this Court. Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that Does 1-10 are entities or individuals who are manufacturing, distributing, importing, displaying, advertising, promoting, selling and/or offering for sale, merchandise in this judicial district which infringes the Nike Trademarks. The identities of the various Does are unknown to Nike at this

6

7

8

9 10 11

14

15

13

12

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

Nike v. Chhay: Complaint

time. Upon information and belief, said fictitiously named defendants are liable to Nike on the basis of the same allegations made herein against Does. Nike will seek leave to amend this Complaint to insert the true names and capacities when the same are ascertained. The named Defendants and Does 1-10 are collectively referred to herein as "Defendants".

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 12. Nike is engaged in the manufacture, design and sale of footwear. apparel, and related accessories. Products manufactured and sold by Nike bear the NIKE trademark, or an arbitrary and distinctive trademark which has come to be known as the Swoosh Design trademark, or a composite trademark consisting of the word NIKE and the Swoosh Design. Nike uses these trademarks on shoes and apparel as trademarks of Nike's high quality products. Nike sells in excess of \$4,500,000,000 a year in merchandise bearing its distinctive trademarks.
- All products described above are sold with one or more of the Nike 13. trademarks alleged in paragraph 8. Nike adopted and used the NIKE and Swoosh Design trademarks in 1971. Nike registered the NIKE trademark in block letters on May 8, 1984, Registration No. 1,277,066 in Class 25 for apparel. Nike registered the Swoosh Design on July 3, 1984, Registration No. 1,284,385 for apparel in Class 25. Nike registered the composite mark of Nike and the Swoosh Design trademark on May 10, 1983, for apparel in Class 25. And, more recently, Nike has registered the NIKE AIR trademark, Registration No. 1,591,006, for apparel in Class 25.
- Additionally, Nike obtained registrations for word marks incorporating the word "air", including AIR JORDAN, AIR MAX and AIR TRAINER. These are some, but by no means all, of Nike's federal trademark registrations. Each of The Nike Trademarks have been registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office pursuant to the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1051). A list of Nike's federal trademark registrations are attached hereto as Exhibit "A". (The trademarks

| | |

Nike v. Chhay: Complaint

identified in Exhibit "A" are collectively referred to herein as the "Nike
Trademarks.") All of the Nike Trademarks are current and in full force and effect
Many of the marks have become incontestable pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1065.
Additionally, all of the Nike Trademarks qualify as famous marks pursuant to 15
U.S.C. § 1125.

- 15. The Nike Trademarks are distinctive when applied to the high quality apparel, footwear and related merchandise signify to the purchaser that the products come from Nike and are manufactured to the highest quality standard. Whether Nike manufactures the products itself, or licenses others to do it, Nike has insured that products bearing its trademarks are manufactured to such standard. Nike's products have been widely accepted by the public and are enormously popular, as demonstrated by billions of dollars in sales each year.
- 16. This enormous popularity is not without cost, as evidenced by the increasing number of counterfeiters in the United States and around the world. Indeed, it is a modern irony that companies measure success by the extent of their counterfeiting problem.

DEFENDANTS' UNLAWFUL CONDUCT

- 17. Defendants are involved in the manufacture, purchase, distribution, offering for sale and/or sale of counterfeit and/or infringing footwear bearing the Nike Trademarks to the general public. Defendants do so using the Websites.
- 18. Nike is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendants processes purchases of counterfeit and infringing footwear incorporating likenesses of one or more of the Nike Trademarks.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Trademark Infringement)

19. Nike hereby repeats and alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 18 above, as if set forth fully herein.

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

27

28

26

Nike v. Chhay: Complaint

- Nike's claim arises under Sections 32 and 43 of the Lanham Act, 15 20. U.S.C. §§ 1114 and 1125, for infringement of registered and unregistered marks.
- Nike owns the exclusive trademark rights to those trademarks listed on Exhibit "A". All of the trademark registrations are in full force and effect. In many instances the trademarks have become incontestable pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1065.
- 22. All advertising and products, including apparel, footwear, watches, jewelry and related merchandise, which have been sold by Nike, or under its authority, have been manufactured and distributed in conformity with the provisions of the United States trademark law.
- Notwithstanding Nike's well known and prior common law and 23. statutory rights in the Nike Trademarks, Defendants have, with actual and constructive notice of Nike's federal registration rights, and long after Nike established its rights in the Nike Trademarks, adopted and used the Nike Trademarks in conjunction with the manufacture, purchase, distribution, offer of sale and sale of footwear in the State of California and in interstate commerce.
- 24. Defendants have caused to be imported, distributed, offered for sale and sold footwear bearing one or more of the Nike Trademarks without the authorization of Nike. Defendants' manufacture, purchase, distribution, offer for sale and sale of footwear and related merchandise bearing the Nike Trademarks in California, and in interstate commerce has and is likely to cause confusion, deception and mistake or to deceive as to the source and origin of the footwear and related merchandise in that the buying public will conclude that the products sold by Defendants are authorized, sponsored, approved or associated with Nike.
- Such confusion, deception and mistake has occurred as a direct result of 25. Defendants' display, advertising and promotion, both in-store and otherwise, of the infringing footwear and other merchandise.

Nike has no adequate remedy at law.

26.

5

7

11 12

14

13

16

15

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28

actual confusion with consumers as to the source and origin of such footwear and other merchandise. Defendants' infringing activities will cause irreparable injury to Nike if 27. Defendants are not restrained by the Court from further violation of Nike's rights, as

Upon information and belief, Defendants' activities have also caused

- Nike has suffered damages as a result of the aforesaid acts. Defendants 28. have profited from its unlawful activities. Unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined, Nike and its goodwill and reputation will continue to suffer irreparable injury which cannot be adequately calculated or compensated solely by money damages. Accordingly, Nike seeks preliminary and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116.
- Defendants' use in commerce of The Nike Trademarks in the sale of 29. footwear and related merchandise is an infringement of Nike's registered trademarks in violation of 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114(1) and 1125.
- Defendants committed the acts alleged herein intentionally, 30. fraudulently, maliciously, willfully, wantonly and oppressively with the intent to injure Nike and its business. Accordingly, Nike is entitled to a judgment of three times its damages and Defendants' profits, together with reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a).
- In order to determine the full extent of such damages, including such 31. profits, Nike will require an accounting from each defendant of all monies generated from the manufacture, importation, distribution and/or sale of the infringing footwear as alleged herein.
- 32. The unlicensed footwear bearing the Nike Trademarks, which was sold. distributed and offered for sale by Defendants constitutes counterfeit products pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d).

3 4

6 7

5

9 10

8

12

11

14

13

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Lanham Act - Unfair Competition)

- Nike hereby repeats and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 33. 1 through 32 above, as if set forth fully herein.
- Nike's claim arises under section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 34. 1125(a) and (d) for false designation of origin and false descriptions and representations in interstate commerce.
- As a direct result of Nike's longstanding use, sales, advertising and 35. marketing, the Nike Trademarks have acquired secondary and distinctive meaning among the public who have come to identify the Nike Trademarks with Nike and its products.
- 36. The unauthorized and counterfeit footwear and related merchandise which has been manufactured, purchased, distributed, offered for sale and sold by Defendants, duplicates and appropriates the Nike Trademarks in order to delude and confuse the public into believing that such footwear and related merchandise are authorized, sponsored, approved or associated with Nike.
- Defendants, by misappropriating and using the likenesses of the Nike 37. Trademarks in connection with the sale of such products, are misrepresenting and will continue to misrepresent and falsely describe to the general public the origin and sponsorship of their products. Defendants have caused such products to enter into interstate commerce willfully, with full knowledge of the falsity of the designation of their origin and description and representation in an effort to mislead the purchasing public into believing that their products are authorized or emanate from Nike.
- 38. Such confusion, deception and mistake has occurred as a direct result of Defendants' display, advertising and promotion, both in-store and otherwise, of the infringing footwear and other merchandise.

3 4

5 6

7 8

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

- Defendants' use in commerce of the Nike Trademarks in the sale of 39. footwear and related merchandise is an infringement of Nike's registered trademarks in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125.
- Defendants have profited from their unlawful activities. Unless 40. Defendants' conduct is enjoined, Nike and its goodwill and reputation will continue to suffer irreparable injury which cannot be adequately calculated or compensated solely by money damages. Accordingly, Nike seeks preliminary and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116.
- Nike has suffered monetary damages as a result of Defendants' acts. In 41. order to determine the full extent of such damages, including such profits as may be recoverable; Nike will require an accounting from Defendants of all monies generated from the manufacture, importation, distribution and/or sale of the infringing footwear as alleged herein.
- Accordingly, Nike is entitled to a judgment of three times its damages 42. and Defendants' profits, together with reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a).

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Lanham Act - Dilution of Famous Mark)

- Nike hereby repeats and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 43. 1 through 42, above, as if set forth fully herein.
- Nike's claim arises under Section 43 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 44. 1125(c).
- 45. As a result of Nike's continuous promotion of its products in conjunction with the Nike Trademarks, the Nike Trademarks have become recognized as distinctive and famous trademarks.
- Defendants' use in commerce of the Nike Trademarks began after the 46. Nike Trademarks had become famous and has caused dilution of the distinctive

6

7

5

8 9

11 12

10

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

27

28

26

quality of the marks. Such conduct has caused injury to Nike pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c).

- 47. Such dilution has occurred as a direct result of Defendants' display. advertising and promotion, both in-store and otherwise, of the infringing footwear and other merchandise.
- 48. Defendants willfully intended to trade on Nike's reputation and/or to cause dilution of the famous trademarks. Accordingly, Nike is entitled to recover its damages, as well as Defendants' profits received as a result of the infringement. pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a).
- 49. Unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined, Nike and its goodwill and reputation will suffer irreparable injury which cannot be adequately calculated or compensated solely by money damages. Accordingly, Nike seeks permanent injunctive relief pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116 and 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c) (1).

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(For Unfair Competition – California Law)

- 50. Nike hereby repeats and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 49, above, as if set forth fully herein.
- 51. The Nike Trademarks have acquired secondary meaning indicative of origin, relationship, sponsorship and/or association with Nike. The purchasing public is likely to attribute to Nike the use by Defendants of the Nike Trademarks or any of them, as a source of origin, authorization and/or sponsorship for Defendants' goods and therefore to purchase such goods based upon that erroneous belief.
- Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that 52. Defendants have intentionally appropriated the Nike trademarks with the intent of causing confusion, mistake and deception as to the source of their goods and with the intent to palm off such goods as those of Nike and, as such, Defendants have committed trademark infringement, misleading advertising and unfair competition,

all in violation of the California Unfair Business Practices Act, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200, et seq.

- 53. Defendants' appropriation, adoption and use of one or more of the Nike Trademarks, including the sale and offering for sale of infringing shoes bearing or using one or more of the Nike Trademarks in connection with the provision of goods is likely to cause confusion between Defendants' infringing product and the goods authorized and licensed by the Nike, thus constituting a violation of the California Unfair Business Practices Act, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200, et seq.
- 54. Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that these deceptive, unfair and fraudulent practices have been undertaken with knowledge by Defendants of their wrongfulness. Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that Defendants' use of Nike's trademarks is for the willful and calculated purpose of misappropriating Plaintiffs' goodwill and business reputation, at Nike's expense and at no expense to Defendants. By taking one or more of the Nike Trademarks, Nike has been deprived of an opportunity to conduct business using its trademarks and deprived of the right to control the use of its trademarks and Defendants have been unjustly enriched.
- 55. Nike has no adequate remedy at law and has suffered and is continuing to suffer irreparable harm and damage as a result of Defendants' acts in an amount thus far not determined but within the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 56. Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that unless enjoined by the Court, the confusion and deception alleged herein and the likelihood thereof will continue with irreparable harm and damage to Nike.
- 57. Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that Defendants have unlawfully and wrongfully derived and will continue to derive income, gains, profits and advantages as a result of their wrongful acts of unfair competition, in amounts thus far not determined but within the jurisdiction of this

Court. Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that it has lost and will continue to lose profits and goodwill as a result of Defendants' conduct.

- 58. By reason of the foregoing acts of unfair competition, Nike is entitled to restitution from Defendants of all income, gains, profits and advantages resulting from their wrongful conduct in amounts to be determined according to proof at trial.
- 59. In order to determine the full extent of such damages, including such profits as may be recoverable; Nike will require an accounting from Defendants of all monies generated from the manufacture, importation, distribution and/or sale of the infringing product.
- 60. Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that Defendants committed the acts alleged herein intentionally, fraudulently, maliciously, willfully, wantonly and oppressively, with intent to injure Nike in its business and with conscious disregard for Nike's rights, thereby justifying awards of punitive and exemplary damages in amounts sufficient to punish and to set an example for others.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Dilution under California Law)

- Nike hereby repeats and realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 61. 1 through 60 above, as if set forth fully herein.
- Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that 62. Defendants' acts have caused a likelihood of injury to Nike's goodwill and business reputation, impaired the effectiveness of Nike's trademarks and diluted its distinctive trade names and trademarks.
- Nike is informed and believes, and upon that basis alleges, that 63. Defendants' acts violate the trademark laws of the State of California and, specifically, California Business and Professions Code, § 14330.
 - Nike has no adequate remedy at law and Defendants' conduct, if not 64.

13

11

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

enjoined, will continue to cause irreparable damage to Nike's rights in their trademarks, trade name, reputation and goodwill.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Nike demands entry of a judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 1) Permanent injunctive relief restraining Defendants, their officers, agents. servants, employees and attorneys, and all those in active concert or participation with them, from:
 - further infringing the Nike Trademarks by manufacturing, producing, a) selling, distributing, circulating, marketing, offering for advertising, promoting, displaying or otherwise disposing of any products not authorized by Nike, including, but not limited to footwear and related merchandise, bearing any simulation, reproduction. counterfeit, copy or colorable imitation of any of the Nike Trademarks ("Unauthorized Products");
 - using any simulation, reproduction, counterfeit, copy or colorable b) imitation of any of the Nike Trademarks in connection with the promotion, advertisement, display, sale, offer for sale, manufacture. production, circulation or distribution of Unauthorized Products in such fashion as to relate or connect, or tend to relate or connect, such products in any way to Nike, or to any goods sold, manufactured, sponsored or approved by, or connected with Nike:
 - c) making any statement or representation whatsoever, or using any false designation of origin or false description, or performing any act, which can or is likely to lead the trade or public, or individual members thereof, to believe that any products manufactured, distributed or sold by Defendants are in any manner associated or connected with Nike, or

Nike v. Chhay: Complaint

- are sold, manufactured, licensed, sponsored, approved or authorized by Nike;
- d) engaging in any other activity constituting unfair competition with Nike, or constituting an infringement of any of Nike's trademarks or of Nike's rights in, or to use or to exploit, said trademarks, or constituting any dilution of any of Nike's names, reputations, or good will;
- e) effecting assignments or transfers, forming new entities or association or utilizing any other device for the purpose of circumventing or otherwise avoiding the prohibitions set forth in Subparagraphs (a) through (d);
- f) secreting, destroying, altering, removing or otherwise dealing with the Unauthorized Products or any books or records which may contain any information relating to the importing, manufacturing, producing, distributing, circulating, selling, marketing, offering for sale, advertising, promoting or displaying of all unauthorized products which infringe any of Nike's trademarks; and
- g) aiding, abetting, contributing to or otherwise assisting anyone from infringing upon Nike's trademarks.
- Directing that Defendants deliver for destruction all Unauthorized Products, including footwear, and labels, signs, prints, packages, dyes, wrappers, receptacles and advertisements relating thereto in their possession or under their control bearing any of the Nike Trademarks or any simulation, reproduction, counterfeit, copy or colorable imitations thereof, and all plates, molds, heat transfers, screens, matrices and other means of making the same.
- 3) Directing such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate to prevent the trade and public from gaining the erroneous impression that any products

manufactured, sold or otherwise circulated or promoted by defendant are authorized by Nike, or related in any way to Nike's products.

- 4) That Nike be awarded from Defendants, as a result of Defendants' sale of Unauthorized Products bearing the Nike Trademarks, three times Nike's damages there from and three times of each of Defendants' profits there from. after an accounting, or, in the alternative statutory damages, should Nike ont for such relief, consisting of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) for each of The Nike Trademarks infringed upon by each of the Defendants. and to the extent this Court concludes such infringement was willful. One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000), for each of The Nike Trademarks infringed upon by each of the Defendants, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1114 and § 1117.
- 5) That Nike be awarded from Defendants three times Nike's damages there from and three times Defendants' profits there from, after an accounting, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) and § 1117.
- That Nike be awarded its reasonable attorney's fees and investigative fees 6) pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117.
- That Nike be awarded punitive damages for Defendants' willful acts of unfair 7) competition under California law.
- That Nike be awarded its costs in bringing this action. 8)
- 9) That Nike have such other and further relief that this Court deems just.

Dated:	Juney	É	2008
) ()	i

J. Andrew Coombs, A Professional Corp.

J. Andrew Coombs Annie S. Wang

Attorneys for Plaintiff Nike, Inc.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b), Nike Inc. hereby demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable.

J. Andrew Coombs, A Professional Corp.

By: J. Andrew Coombs

Annie S. Wang Attorneys for Plaintiff Nike, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

Nike Registrations

Trademark Registration Number Registration Date					
Swoosh® Design	977,190	January 22, 1974			
Nike®	1,277,066	May 8, 1984			
Swoosh® Design	1,284,385	July 3, 1984			
Nike® and Swoosh®	1,237,469	May 10, 1983			
Design					
Nike Air®	1,571,066	December 12, 1989			
Air Jordan® Design	1,742,019	December 22, 1992			
5		(Class 18 and 25)			
Just Do It®	1,875,307	January 24, 1995			
Nike [®]	2,196,735	October 13, 1998			
		(Class 14)			
Nike® and Swoosh®	2,209,815	December 8, 1998			
Design		(Class 14)			
AIR-SOLE	1,145,812	January 13, 1981			
SWOOSH	1,200,529	July 6, 1982			
NIKE	1,214,930	November 2, 1982			
NIKE AIR w/Swoosh	1,284,386	July 3, 1984			
device					
NIKE AIR	1,307,123	November 27, 1984			
Swoosh device on shoe	1,323,342	March 5, 1985			
Swoosh device	1,323,343	March 5, 1985			
NIKE w/Swoosh device	1,325,938	March 19, 1985			
AIR JORDAN	1,370,283	November 12, 1985			
AIR MAX	1,508,348	October 11, 1988			
AIR TRAINER	1,508,360	October 11, 1988			
Jump Man device	1,558,100	September 26, 1989			
AIR SKYLON	1,665,479	November 19, 1991			
AIR SOLO FLIGHT	1,668,590	December 17, 1991			
AIR FLIGHT	1,686,515	May 12, 1992			
AIR DESCHUTZ	1,735,721	November 24, 1992			
AIR TRAINER MAX	1,789,463	August 24, 1993			
RUNWALK device	1,877,672	February 7, 1995			
STARTER	1,896,998	May 30, 1995			
NIKE GOLF	1,944,436	December 26, 1995			
NIKE REGRIND	2,022,321	December 10, 1996			

Nike v. Chhay: Complaint

- 17 -

	Case 2:08-cv-00061-R	-CW Document 1	Filed 01/04/2008	Page 19 of 21
--	----------------------	----------------	------------------	---------------

ATDA (AXX 1	2 020 750	I14 1007
AIRMAX in oval	2,030,750	January 14, 1997
AIR UPTEMPO in crest	2,032,582	January 21, 1997
NIKE REGRIND in crest	2,042,940	March 11, 1997
AIR with Swoosh device	2,068,075	June 3, 1997
NIKE with Swoosh device	2,104,329	October 7, 1997
ACG NIKE in triangle	2,117,273	December 2, 1997
Stylized "B"	2,476,882	August 14, 2001
NIKE ALPHA PROJECT	2,517,735	December 11, 2001
as device		
Ellipses device	2,521,178	December 18, 2001
STORM-FIT	2,551,655	March 26, 2002
Baseballer silhouette	2,571,726	May 21, 2002
device		
Reverse "Z" in rectangle	2,584,382	June 25, 2002
device		
NIKE GOLF with crest	2,628.587	October 1, 2002
WAFFLE RACER	2,652,318	November 19, 2002
PHYLITE	2,657,832	December 10, 2002
TRUNNER	2,663,568	December 17, 2002
DRI-STAR	2,691,476	February 25, 2003
BOING	2,735,172	July 8, 2003
Swoosh with clubs crest	2,753,357	August 19, 2003
PRESTO	2,716,140	May 13, 2003
FOOTENT	2,798,233	December 23, 2003
FOOTENT in device	2,798,234	December 23, 2003
TRIAX	2,810,679	February 3, 2004
R9	2,843,275	May 18, 2004
WAFFLE TRAINER	2,893,674	October 12, 2004
THERMA-STAR	2,960,844	June 7, 2005
NIKE SHOX	2,970,902	July 19, 2005
STARTER	2,971,216	July 19, 2005
Basketball player outline	2,977,850	July 26, 2005
STAR FLEX	3,002,455	September 27, 2005
10//2 in rectangle	3,057,889	February 7, 2006
NIKEFREE	3,087,455	May 2, 2006

CIV	71T	COV	JFR	SHEF	'7
	, ,,		/ P. P.	3000	

_		CIVIL	OVER SHEE	L I				
I(a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENI	DANTS				
Nike, Inc.				ith Chhay, So	ophorn Chhay, es 1-10, inclus	Steve Chhay, K	hemora Ch	or,
			1		•	IVE, ISTED DEFENDA	ANT LOS A	Ingelec
	E OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF J.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	Washington	- COONTT			F CASES ONLY)		Migeles
(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAI	ME, ADDRESS AND TELEPHON	E NUMBER)	ATTORNE	YS (IF KNOW	VN)			
J. Andrew Coombs (SBN 1	123881) / Annie S. Wang (SBN	243027)						
J. Andrew Coombs, A P. C		•						
517 East Wilson Avenue, S	uite 202, Glendale, California 9	1206	ŀ					
Telephone: (818) 500-3200	0/ Facsimile: (818) 500-3201							
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	CTION (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX	ONLY) III.	CITIZENS (For Diversity C			PARTIES (PLA		
□ 1 U.S. Government	Federal Question			PTF D	EF			PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Cit	izen of This State	e 🗆 1 🗆	1 Incorpo	rated or Principal	Place of	□4 □4
□ 2 U.S. Government □ 4 Defendant	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties In	Item III) Cit	izen of Another S	State □ 2 □	Busines	s In This State rated and Principa		5 5
	•	, l	:	6- D2 D	Busines	s In Another State		
		For	izen or Subject o eign Country	fa □3 □	3 Foreign	Nation		□6 □6
IV. ORIGIN (PLACE AN x II) 1 Original 2 Removed Proceeding State Cour	from 3 Remanded from	□ 4 Reinstate Reopene	d a	Γransferred from		ilti-district igation	7 Appeal to Judge fro	m Magistrate
V DEQUESTED IN CO.	MDI AINT:		(:	specify)			Judgment	<u> </u>
V. REQUESTED IN CO.	IVIPLATIVI. CTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 DEMA	ND C	Chaolt VE	C anly if dama	ndad in aamnlai	nt: JURY DEN	MAND.	VEC II NO
□ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS A	CTION UNDER F.R.C.F. 23 DEMIA		Check 1E	3 Only II demai	ilded in complai	nt. JUNI DEI	VIAND. W	ILS DIO
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	(CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE U	NDER WHICH YO	U ARE FILING A	ND WRITE A BI	RIEF STATEMEN	IT OF CAUSE.		
DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIO	NAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY	7.)						
Trademark infringement 15	U.S.C. §§ 1051, et seq.							
-								
VIII NATURE OF CUIT	(DI ACE AN IN ONE BO	V OM V						
VII. NATURE OF SUIT		A UNL1)						
OTHER STATUTES □ 400 State	CONTRACT □ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL IN	TORTS JULIEV PER	SONAL INJUI		TURE / PENALT Agriculture	Y BAN □ 422 A ₁	NKRUPTCY
Reapportionment	□ 120 Marine	□ 310 Airplan	I .	52 Personal Inju		Other Food & Dri		USC 158
□ 410 Antitrust	□ 130 Miller Act	□ 315 Airplan		Med Malpra		Drug Related	□ 423 W	
□ 430 Banks and Banking	□ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liabilit		5 Personal Inju	· .	Seizure of Propert	ty 28	3 USC 157
	□ 150 Recovery of Overpayment		, Libel &	Product Liab	ersonal 🗆 630	21 USC 881	DROBERT	TY RIGHTS
 □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and 	& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander □ 330 Fed. En		Injury Produ		R.R. & Truck	□ 820 Cd	
Corrupt Organizations	□ 151 Medicare Act	Liabilit		Liability		Airline Regs	□ 830 Pa	
□ 810 Selective Service	☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	□ 340 Marine	PER	SONAL PROP	PERTY □ 660	Occupational	■ 840 Tr	ademark
□ 850 Securities/Commodities/	Student Loan	□ 345 Marine		Other Fraud		Safety /Health	200111	
Exchange	(Excl. Veterans)	Liabilit	· .	71 Truth in Len	~	Other		SECURITY A (1395ff)
□ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410	☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	□ 350 Motor '□ 355 Motor '	1	30 Other Persor Property Da				ack Lung (923)
□ 891 Agricultural Act	□ 160 Stockholders' Suits	L .		35 Property Da	· -	Fair Labor	_	IWC/DIWW
□ 892 Economic Stabilization	□ 190 Other Contract	□ 360 Other P	*	Product Lial	-	Standards Act		05(g))
Act	☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Injury		A	□ 720	Labor/Mgmt.		SID Title XVI
□ 893 Environmental Matters				A LED DESIGN		Relations	□ 865 RS	SI (405(g))
□ 894 Energy Allocation Act	REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS		SONER PETIT		Labor/Mgmt.	EEDED AT	TAVSLITS
□ 895 Freedom of Information	☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employ		O Motions to N Sentence Ha		Reporting & Disclosure Act	□ 870 Ta	L TAX SUITS
Act □ 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-	□ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	443 Housin		Corpus		Railway Labor		aintiff or
nation Under Equal	□ 240 Torts to Land			30 General		Act	D	efendant)
Access to Justice	☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	□ 444 Welfare	l l	35 Death Penal	· 1	Other Labor		S-Third Party
□ 950 Constitutionality of	□ 290 All Other Real Property	□ 440 Other C		10 Mandamus/		Litigation Empl. Ret. Inc.	26	USC 7609
State Statutes □ 890 Other Statutory Actions				50 Civil Rights 55 Prison Cond		Security Act		
	ASES: Has this action been pro	eviously filed a	ınd dismissed, ı	remanded or	closed?□YES	₩NO	<u> </u>	
• •								
,,								
CV-71 (10/01)		CIVIL COVER	SHEET					Page 1 of 2
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	☐ Pro Hac Vice fee: ☐ paid	1 1						
0071102 022 0	Applying IFP	□ not paid Judge		Mag. J	ludae			

CIVIL COVER SHEET (Reverse Side)

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM JS-44C, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have a	any cases been previousl	y filed that are related to the present case? ☐YES MNO
If yes, list case number(s):		
	PLY)	AY FILED CASE AND THE PRESENT CASE: ar to arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, happenings, or events; we the same or substantially the same parties or property; we the same patent, trademark or copyright; for determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law, or we for other reasons may entail unnecessary duplication of labor if heard by different judges.
IX. VENUE: List the Californi CHECK HERE IF THE US	a County, or State i GOVERNMENT,	If other than California, in which EACH named plaintiff resides (Use an additional sheet if necessary) ITS AGENCIES OR EMPLOYEES IS A NAMED PLAINTIFF.
Oregon		
List the California County, or S CHECK HERE IF THE US Los Angeles - all defendants	tate if other than Ca GOVERNMENT,	alifornia, in which EACH named defendant resides. (Use an additional sheet if necessary). ITS AGENCIES OR EMPLOYEES IS A NAMED DEFENDANT.
List the California County, or S	State if other than C cases, use the location	alifornia, in which EACH claim arose. (Use an additional sheet if necessary) on of the tract of land involved.
Los Angeles		
the filing and service of pleadir September 1974, is required put	TIES: The CV-71 ags or other papers rsuant to Local Rul	ER): X (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in e 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and I instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)
Key to Statistical codes relating	to Social Security	Cases:
NATURE OF SUIT CODE	ABBREVIATION	SUBSTANTIVE STATEMENT OF CAUSE OF ACTION
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))
CV-71 (10/01)		CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2