Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial

THE PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff Fitness IQ is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, having its principal place of business at 2387 La Miranda Drive, Vista, California 92081.
- 3. On information and belief, Defendant HSM IDEATV CORPORATION ("Defendant") is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey, having its principal place of business at 606 West 42nd Street, Suite 414, New York, New York 10036.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. Jurisdiction of these claims arise under the patent laws of the United States as set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 271, *et seq.*, and under the trademark laws of the United States as set forth in the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051 *et seq.*
- 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (diversity), and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) (patents, trademarks, and trade dress).
- 6. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (2) in that a substantial portion of the events giving rise to the claim occurred in this District, and Defendant does business in and therefore is deemed to reside in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c). This Court is also a proper venue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) for the same reasons.
- 7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendant by virtue of the fact that it has availed itself of the forum by doing business here, by virtue of its actions of infringement by offers for sales and/or sales of infringing product to California customers, and by having conducted the acts giving rise to these claims in the State of California and the Southern District of California.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

8. Since at least as early as July 25, 2009, Plaintiff has designed, manufactured, distributed, and extensively advertised its SHAKE WEIGHT® products in commerce. Plaintiff's proprietary SHAKE WEIGHT® free weights are special pulsating dumbbells for shaping and toning the upper body, designed for a daily six-minute workout.

- 9. Plaintiff is the owner of SHAKE WEIGHT®, United States Trademark Registration Nos. 3,702,459 ("the '459 Registration") and 3,767,175 ("the '175 Registration") for "manually-operated exercise equipment." True and correct copies of the Trademark Applications and Registrations Retrieval ("TARR") database records for the '459 Registration and the '175 Registration are attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.
- 10. Plaintiff has applied for registration of the SHAKE trademark under United States Trademark Serial No. 77/980,964 ("the '964 Application") for "manually-operated exercise equipment." The United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") issued a Notice of Allowance for the '964 Application on October 26, 2010. Plaintiff filed a Statement of Use with the USPTO for the '964 Application on November 15, 2010. The USPTO issued its Notice of Acceptance of the Statement of Use on January 19, 2011. A true and correct copy of the Trademark Applications and Registrations Retrieval ("TARR") database record for the '964 Application is attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.
- 11. Plaintiff has also applied for registration of the SHAKE FITNESS trademark under United States Trademark Serial No. 77/902,804 ("the '804 Application") for "manually-operated exercise equipment." The USPTO issued a Notice of Allowance for the '804 Application on November 2, 2010. A true and correct copy of the Trademark Applications and Registrations Retrieval ("TARR") database record for the '804 Application is attached hereto as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.
- 12. On August 5, 2009, Plaintiff filed a design patent application with the USPTO for its SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells. On December 7, 2010, the USPTO issued United States Patent No. D628,660 ("the '660 Patent") for "exercise device," the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbell. The '660 Patent is valid and enforceable. A true and correct copy of the '660 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit D and incorporated by reference.
- 13. Since at least as early as July 25, 2009, Plaintiff has extensively advertised its SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells, especially in the form of commercials and infomercials seen on network television, cable television, and the Internet. Since its inception, Plaintiff has spent more than \$6.4 million to advertise SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells for women in direct response

On September 21, 2010, ESPN featured the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells for

SHAKE WEIGHT® product with his guest, actress Emma Stone.

26

27

28

20.

8 9

11

10

12 13

14

16

15

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

- Mort" show. In ESPN's commercial, NFL player Dwight Freeney was shown to have a SHAKE WEIGHT® for men in his fictional garage.
- 21. In addition to the television shows documented above, the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells have also been featured in HBO's "Hard Knocks," Comedy Central's "South Park," CBS's "Two and a Half Men," and the David Letterman show.
- 22. Since July 2009, sales for the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells have exceeded \$60 million. Through these sales and extensive and widespread publicity as exemplified above, Plaintiff has developed substantial secondary meaning in the design of its SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells.
- 23. On or around December 2010, Plaintiff became aware that Defendant was selling knock-offs of the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells under the mark "Fitness Shake." On or around December 15, 2010, Plaintiff sent a cease and desist letter to Defendant, informing Defendant of its intellectual property rights in the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells. A true and correct copy of this letter is attached as Exhibit E and incorporated by reference.
- 24. On or around December 17, 2010, Defendant responded in writing by email to Plaintiff's counsel, claiming that Defendant has "ceased all activities relating to the sale, offering for sale or distribution" of the "Fitness Shake" dumbbells. A true and correct copy of this email is attached as Exhibit F and incorporated by reference.
- 25. Despite Defendant's representation that it would no longer sell, offer for sale, or distribute the "Fitness Shake" dumbbells, Plaintiff has been informed and believes that Defendant has nevertheless continued to do so. On or around the beginning of December 2010, the Midwest home improvement store chain Menards indicated that it intended to place an order of 200,000 units of SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells from Plaintiff through Plaintiff's agent. However, on or around December 14, 2010, the Menards buyer informed Plaintiff's agent that unless Plaintiff lowered its price for SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells, Menards would buy the cheaper "Fitness Shake" dumbbells from Defendant. On or around January 19, 2011, Plaintiff discovered that Menards will not proceed with the prospective order of SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells, and has instead ordered the cheaper "Fitness Shake" dumbbells from Defendant. On

information and belief, some time in the beginning of January, Menards has placed an order with Defendant for 180,000 units of the "Fitness Shake" dumbbell (an estimated retail value of \$1,800,000) with the target delivery date some time during the first week of March, 2011.

- 26. The design and trade dress of the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells for women include without limitation a contoured handle, stylized indentations in the handle, two flexible boots which are located between the handle and a recessed groove of the end weights, two cylindrical end weights, and reflective surfaces on the end weights. The end weights feature an inner circle on their ends and an outer ring surface.
- 27. The "Fitness Shake" dumbbells are clear knock-offs of the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells. The "Fitness Shake" dumbbells are approximately the same size and weight of the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells. The "Fitness Shake" dumbbell also consists of a contoured handle, stylized indentations in the handle, two flexible boots which are located between the handle and a recessed groove of the end weights, two cylindrical end weights that feature an inner circle on their ends and an outer ring surface, and reflective surfaces on the end weights. The only perceivable differences are that the "Fitness Shake" dumbbell contains indentations in the handle that run parallel, rather than perpendicular, to the end weights; and that the "Fitness Shake" dumbbell is of a cheaper, inferior quality.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Infringement of United States Design Patent No. D628,660

- 28. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges herein as if set forth at length the allegations of the preceding paragraphs above.
- 29. Plaintiff is the owner of United States Patent No. D628,660 ("the '660 Patent") for "exercise device," the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbell. The '660 Patent is valid and enforceable.
- 30. Defendant has designed, manufactured, distributed, and/or imported its "Fitness Shake" dumbbells. On information and belief, the overwhelming similarities between the "Fitness Shake" and Plaintiff's proprietary SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells were meant to

28 outer rin

- capitalize on the popularity of Plaintiff's proprietary SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells and its unique and distinctive design.
- 31. Defendant's "Fitness Shake" dumbbells infringe upon the '660 Patent, as an ordinary observer would be deceived into believing that the "Fitness Shake" dumbbells are the same as the patented SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbell design. The overall appearance of the "Fitness Shake" dumbbells are deceptively similar to the overall appearance of Plaintiff's proprietary SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells.
 - 32. Defendant's infringing acts constitute a violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271(a).
- 33. As a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has been injured in an amount not yet fully determined, but believed to be in excess of \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interests. In addition, as a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm, and Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law with respect to this injury. Unless Defendant's infringing acts are enjoined by this Court, Plaintiff will continue to suffer a risk of irreparable harm.
- 34. On information and belief, Defendant's infringing acts have been knowing, intentional, wanton, and willful, entitling Plaintiff to treble damages, profits, attorneys fees and costs pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284 in this Court's discretion.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Trade Dress Infringement Under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)

- 35. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges herein as if set forth at length the allegations of the preceding paragraphs above.
- 36. Plaintiff's SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbell and the product packaging accompanying the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbell constitute protectable trade dress under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a). The trade dress of the SHAKE WEIGHT® for women dumbbell includes without limitation a contoured handle, stylized indentations in the handle, two flexible boots which are located between the handle and a recessed groove of the end weights, and two cylindrical end weights. The end weights feature an inner circle on their ends and an outer ring surface.

- 37. The trade dress of Plaintiff's SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbell is not functional.
- 38. Defendant's acts of designing or having designed, manufacturing or having manufactured, selling, distributing, and/or importing the "Fitness Shake" products in interstate commerce, without Plaintiff's consent, constitutes infringement of Plaintiff's trade dress, and has caused and continues to cause a likelihood of confusion, mistake, and deception as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, and/or connection in the minds of the public, in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 39. As a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has been injured in an amount not yet fully determined, but believed to be in excess of \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interests. In addition, as a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm, and Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law with respect to this injury. Unless Defendant's infringing acts are enjoined by this Court, Plaintiff will continue to suffer a risk of irreparable harm.
- 40. On information and belief, Defendant's infringing acts have been knowing, intentional, wanton, and willful, entitling Plaintiff to treble damages, profits, attorneys fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117 in this Court's discretion.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Trademark Infringement Under 15 U.S.C. § 1114(a)

- 41. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges herein as if set forth at length the allegations of the preceding paragraphs above.
- 42. Plaintiff is the owner of the '459 Registration and the '175 Registration for SHAKE WEIGHT® in association with "manually-operated exercise equipment," the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells.
- 43. Defendant's acts of designing or having designed, manufacturing or having manufactured, selling, distributing, and/or importing the "Fitness Shake" dumbbells in interstate commerce, without Plaintiff's consent, constitutes infringement of Plaintiff's registered trademarks, and has caused and continues to cause a likelihood of confusion, mistake, and

deception as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, and/or connection in the minds of the public, in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(a).

- 44. As a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has been injured in an amount not yet fully determined, but believed to be in excess of \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interests. In addition, as a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm, and Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law with respect to this injury. Unless Defendant's infringing acts are enjoined by this Court, Plaintiff will continue to suffer a risk of irreparable harm.
- 45. On information and belief, Defendant's infringing acts have been knowing, intentional, wanton, and willful, entitling Plaintiff to treble damages, profits, attorneys fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117 in this Court's discretion.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Trademark Infringement and False Designation of Origin Under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)

- 46. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges herein as if set forth at length the allegations of the preceding paragraphs above.
- 47. Plaintiff is the owner of the valid trademark SHAKE™ in association with "manually-operated exercise equipment" through priority of use in commerce and/or through acquisition of secondary meaning.
- 48. Defendant's acts of designing or having designed, manufacturing or having manufactured, selling, distributing, and/or importing the "Fitness Shake" dumbbells in interstate commerce, without Plaintiff's consent, constitutes infringement of Plaintiff's SHAKETM trademark, and has caused and continues to cause a likelihood of confusion, mistake, and deception as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, and/or connection in the minds of the public, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 49. As a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has been injured in an amount not yet fully determined, but believed to be in excess of \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interests. In addition, as a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm, and Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law with respect to this injury.

Unless Defendant's infringing acts are enjoined by this Court, Plaintiff will continue to suffer a risk of irreparable harm.

50. On information and belief, Defendant's infringing acts have been knowing, intentional, wanton, and willful, entitling Plaintiff to treble damages, profits, attorneys fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117 in this Court's discretion.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Trademark Infringement Under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.

- 51. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges herein as if set forth at length the allegations of the preceding paragraphs above.
- 52. Plaintiff is the owner of the SHAKE WEIGHT, SHAKE WEIGHT + design, and SHAKE trademarks for "manually-operated exercise equipment." The SHAKE WEIGHT, SHAKE WEIGHT + design, and SHAKE trademarks constitute "Marks" as defined by Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202.
- 53. Defendant's acts of designing or having designed, manufacturing or having manufactured, selling, distributing, and/or importing the "Fitness Shake" dumbbells in interstate commerce, without Plaintiff's consent, constitutes infringement of Plaintiff's Marks, and has caused and continues to cause a likelihood of confusion, mistake, and deception as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, and/or connection in the minds of the public, in violation of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 *et seq*.
- 54. As a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has been injured in an amount not yet fully determined, but believed to be in excess of \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interests. In addition, as a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm, and Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law with respect to this injury. Unless Defendant's infringing acts are enjoined by this Court, Plaintiff will continue to suffer a risk of irreparable harm.
- 55. On information and belief, Defendant's infringing acts have been knowing, intentional, wanton, and willful, entitling Plaintiff to treble damages, profits, attorneys fees and

discretion.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

costs pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 3294 and Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a) in this Court's

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unfair Competition Under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.

- 56. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges herein as if set forth at length the allegations of the preceding paragraphs above.
- 57. California Business & Professions Code § 17200 provides that unfair competition means and includes "any unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice and unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertising."
- 58. By and through Defendant's conduct, including the conduct detailed above, Defendant has engaged in activities that constitute unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices prohibited by Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.
- 59. Defendant's acts of intentional and willful trademark, trade dress, and design patent infringement as alleged above constitute unfair competition actionable under the laws of the State of California as unlawful business acts or practices in that, *inter alia*, said acts violate the United States patent laws, 35 U.S.C. § 271 et seq. and the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114(a), 1125(a), and Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.
- 60. Defendant's acts of intentional and willful trademark, trade dress, and design patent infringement as alleged above constitute unfair competition actionable under the laws of the State of California as unfair business acts or practices in that, inter alia, said acts of producing knock-offs of Plaintiff's proprietary SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells in order to appropriate the substantial value of Plaintiff's investment and effort in design and marketing without paying for it and then underselling these products in direct competition with Plaintiffs SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells are immoral, unethical, oppressive, and unscrupulous.
- 61. Defendant's acts of intentional and willful trademark, trade dress, and design patent infringement as alleged above constitute unfair competition actionable under the laws of the State of California as fraudulent business acts of practices in that, inter alia, said acts are likely to confuse the public as to the origin of the infringing products.

- 62. Defendant's acts of intentional and willful trademark, trade dress, and design patent infringement as alleged above constitute unfair competition actionable under the laws of the State of California as deceptive and false advertising in that, *inter alia*, said acts are likely to cause confusion, mistake, and deception.
- 63. The above described acts and omissions are unlawful, unfair, fraudulent, deceptive, misleading, and untrue, and constitute a violation of Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.* Plaintiff reserves the right to identify additional violations by Defendant as may be established through discovery.
- 64. As a result of Defendant's said acts of unfair competition, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm. Unless the acts of unfair competition are enjoined by this Court, Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable harm.
- 65. As a direct and legal result of Defendant's unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent conduct described above, Defendant has been and will continue to be unjustly enriched with illgotten gains, to which Plaintiff has the right to recover.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

California Common Law Unfair Competition

- 66. Plaintiff incorporates and re-alleges herein as if set forth at length the allegations of the preceding paragraphs above.
- 67. Plaintiff is the owner of the valid marks SHAKE WEIGHT® and SHAKETM in association with "manually-operated exercise equipment," namely, the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells. The design of the SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells is also protected by the '660 Patent and common law trade dress.
- 68. Defendant's "Fitness Shake" dumbbells are an imitation of Plaintiff's proprietary SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells.
- 69. On information and belief, Defendant introduced the "Fitness Shake" dumbbells into commerce with the purpose of deceiving the unwary public into buying the imitation under the impression that it is purchasing Plaintiff's SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells.

- 70. Plaintiff's SHAKE WEIGHT® dumbbells and Defendant's "Fitness Shake" dumbbells are in direct competition.
- 71. As a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has been injured in an amount not yet fully determined, but believed to be in excess of \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interests. In addition, as a result of Defendant's infringing acts, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm, and Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law with respect to this injury. Unless Defendant's infringing acts are enjoined by this Court, Plaintiff will continue to suffer a risk of irreparable harm.
- 72. On information and belief, Defendant has acted in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, entitling Plaintiff to punitive damages in this Court's discretion.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court grant relief as follows:

- a. Judgment in favor of Plaintiff on all claims herein;
- b. A temporary restraining order, and a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing Defendant and those additional parties specified in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 65(d) from continued infringement of Plaintiff's intellectual property rights, including trademarks, common law trade dress, and design patent, United States Patent No. D628,660 ("the '660 Patent"), and any and continued unfair competition;
- c. An accounting of profits and damages resulting from Defendant's trade dress and design patent infringement and unfair competition, and trebling of such damages for the knowing, intentional, willful, and wanton nature of Defendant's conduct;
- d. On the trademark and trade dress infringement claims, an award to Plaintiff of (i) an amount equal to the actual damages suffered by Plaintiff as a result of the infringement of its proprietary trade dress; (ii) an amount equal to the profits earned by Defendant as a result of its infringing creation, design, distribution, packaging, and sales, or as a result of Defendant's purchase and re-sale of their infringing products; (iii) an amount equal to three times the monetary award assessed in view of Defendant's willful and wanton infringement under 15 U.S.C. § 1117; (iv) prejudgment and post-judgment interest; (v) an amount equal to Plaintiff's

reasonable attorneys fees, on the basis that this action is an "exceptional" case under 15 U.S.C. § 1117;

- e. On the design patent infringement claim, an award to Plaintiff of (i) an amount equal to the actual damages suffered by Plaintiff as a result of the infringement of its design patent, but no less than a reasonably royalty for the use made by Defendant of the infringing product; (ii) an amount equal to the profits earned by Defendant as a result of its infringing creation, design, distribution, packaging, and sales, or as a result of Defendant's purchase and resale of their infringing products; (iii) an amount equal to three times the monetary award assessed in view of Defendant's willful and wanton infringement under 35 U.S.C. § 384; (iv) prejudgment and post-judgment interest; (v) an amount equal to Plaintiff's reasonable attorneys fees, on the basis that this action is an "exceptional" case under 35 U.S.C. § 385;
- f. An award to Plaintiff any additional remedies from infringement of the '660 Patent by Defendant as provided in 35 U.S.C. § 289;
- g. On the California trademark infringement claim, (i) an amount equal to up to three times the profits earned by Defendant as a result of its infringing creation, design, distribution, packaging, and sales, or as a result of Defendant's purchase and re-sale of their infringing products, (ii) an amount equal to up to three times the damages suffered by Plaintiff as a result of Defendant's infringing creation, design, distribution, packaging, and sales, or as a result of Defendant's purchase and re-sale of their infringing products, and (iii) destruction and/or recall of all materials bearing the infringing mark from the market;
- h. On the common law unfair competition claim, compensatory and punitive damages;
- i. Disgorgement of all profits and restitution made in connection or associated with the sale of the infringing products under California Business & Professions Code § 17200 *et seq.*;
- j. An order for the seizure and forfeiture of all goods infringing upon Plaintiff's trademarks, the '660 Patent, and SHAKE WEIGHT® trade dress and trademark upon delivery into the United States pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1337;
 - k. An award of punitive damages for intentional and willful acts;

An award of interest, attorneys fees and costs; and 1. Such other and further relief as the Court deems proper. m. Dated: January 25, 2011 Respectfully submitted, GORDON & REES LLP /s/Richard P. Sybert Richard P. Sybert by Yuo-Fong C. Amato Attorneys for Plaintiff FITNESS IQ, LLC -15-

Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial

\$\partial ase 3:11-cv-00160-H -WMC Document 1 Filed 01/25/11 Page 15 of 18

1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL									
2	Plaintiff demands a trial by jury for all claims triable by a jury.									
3										
4	Dated: January 25, 2011	Respectfully submitted,								
5		GORDON & REES LLP								
6										
7	by	/s/Richard P. Sybert Richard P. Sybert								
8		/s/Richard P. Sybert Richard P. Sybert Yuo-Fong C. Amato Attorneys for Plaintiff FITNESS IQ, LLC								
9		FITNESS IQ, LLC								
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28 4v.1	-16-									

VRHM/1065886/8950154v.1

Case 3:11-cv-00160-H -WMC Document 1 Filed 01/25/11 Page 17 of 18

S JS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating

the civil docket sheet. (SEE INS	TRUCTIONS ON THE REV	ERSE OF THE FO	PRM.)	,,,								
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Fitness IQ, LLC				DEFENDANTS HSM IdeaTV Corporation								
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant New York (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED. Attorneys (If Known)								
Richard P. Sybert	/ monoje (n ratown)											
Yuo-Fong C. Amato												
Gordon & Rees LLP	'11 CV0160 BEN CAB											
101 West Broadway, Suite												
San Diego, California 921					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) PTF DEF PTF DEF								
U.S. Government Plaintiff			Ci	tizen of This State	<u> </u>	i i	Incorporated or Princip of Business In Thi		□ ⁴	□ 4		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	_		Ci	tizen of Another State	□ 2	□ 2	Incorporated and Princ of Business In An	-	□ 5	□ 5		
W. W. Stranger			Ci	tizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation		☐ 6	□ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT CONTRACT		y) ORTS		FORFEITURE/PE	NALTY	1 10	BANKRUPTCY	OT	HER STAT	TITEC		
14	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL IN.	JURY	610 Agriculture	MALII		Appeal 28 USC 158		te Reapportio			
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	☐ 362 Personal Inju Med. Malpu ☐ 365 Personal Inju	actice ury —	620 Other Food & 625 Drug Related of Property 2 630 Liquor Laws	Seizure	423	Withdrawal 28 USC 157	410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation				
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander	Product Lial 368 Asbestos Pe	rsonal	640 R.R. & Truck			PERTY RIGHTS Copyrights	☐470 Rad	keteer Influe			
151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted	51 Medicare Act 330 Federal Employers' Injury Produc 52 Recovery of Defaulted Liability Liability		ıct	650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational			Patent	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit				
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	340 Marine 345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PRO		Safety/Health 690 Other		Mar Co.	Indoork 1866	490 Cable/Sat TV				
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Recovery of Overpayment Liability 370 Other Fraud of Veteran's Benefits 350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Persona Stockholders' Suits 355 Motor Vehicle			LABOR		SOC	CIAL SECURITY	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge				
			onal				HIA (1395ff)					
160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury	385 Property Da	mage	Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations		862	Black Lung (923) DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 12 12 12	USC 3410	Actions		
	196 Franchise Product Liability			730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting		864	SSID Title XVI	891 Agricultural Acts				
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PET		& Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act		□ 865	RSI (405(g))	892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters				
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	441 Voting 510 Motion 442 Employment Senter		Vacate	790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc.		FFDE	ERAL TAX SUITS	894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information				
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property		443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalt		Security Act	•		Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	Act	1			
245 Tort Product Liability	444 Welfare						or Defendant)		eal of Fee Do der Equal Ac			
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Manda Employment 550 Civil I			IMMIGRATION 462 Naturalization Application			IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	to Justice				
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities – Other ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	446 Amer. w/Disabilities - 555 Prison Condi Other		463 Habeas Corpus Alien Detained 465 Other Immigra	eas Corpus – n Detainee r Immigration				☐950 Constitutionality of State Statutes			
V. ORIGIN Proceeding Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Appellate Court Reopened Actions Appellate Court Actions Appellate Court Actions Appeal to District Appeal to District 5 another district 6 Multidistrict 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment Magistrate Magistrate Judgment Magistrate Magistrate												
	Cite the U.S. Civil St	atute under which	you are f	iling (Do not cite ju	risdictio	nal stat	utes unless diversity					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N 35 U.S.C.§ 271											
	Brief description of c Infringement of I											
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	DEMAND \$	MAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ☑ Yes ☐ No										
VIII. RELATED CASE(IF ANY	(See instructions):	JDGE <u>Hon. Mar</u>	ilyn L.	Huff		DOCKE	ET NUMBER 10-cv			<u> </u>		
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD												
January 25, 2011 s/Richard P. Sybert												
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	AOIDE											
RECEIPT # A	MOUNTA	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	·		MAG. JUDGE					
									merican Lega ww.Forms <i>W</i>			

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 12/07)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553
- Brief Description: <u>Unauthorized reception of cable service</u>

 VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

VRHM/1065886/8943647v.1

American LegalNet, Inc. www.FormsWorkflow.com