1 2 3 4 5	Andrew D. Skale (SBN 211096) askale@mintz.com Ben L. Wagner (SBN 243594) bwagner@mintz.com MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY ANI 3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92130 Telephone: (858) 314-1500 Facsimile: (858) 314-1501	D POPEO PC					
6 7	Attorneys for Plaintiff ZIPBUDS, LLC						
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
10	ZIPBUDS, LLC.	Case No. '12CV0768 MMAPOR					
11	Plaintiff, v.	PLAINTIFF ZIPBUDS' COMPLAINT FOR DESIGN PATENT AND TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT; AND UNFAIR					
13 14	MIZCO INTERNATIONAL, LLC; ECKO COMPLEX, LLC d/b/a ECKO UNLIMITED; and IP HOLDINGS UNLTD, LLC	JURY DEMANDED					
15	Defendant.						
16							
17							
18	Plaintiff ZIPBUDS, LLC. for its Complaint against Defendants MIZCO						
19	INTERNATIONAL, LLC; ECKO COMPLEX, LLC d/b/a ECKO UNLIMITED; and IP						
20	HOLDINGS UNLTD, LLC alleges and states as follows:						
21	THE PARTIES						
22	1. Plaintiff ZIPBUDS, LLC, ("Zipbuds") is a limited liability company organized and						
23	existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business located at 3125						
24	Tiger Run Court, Suite 105, Carlsbad California.						
25	2. Defendant IP HOLDINGS UNLTD, LLC ("IP Holdings") is a limited liability						
26	company organized and existing, on information and belief, under the laws of the State of New						
27	York, with its principal place of business at, on information and belief, 40 West 23rd Street, 6th						
28	Floor, New York New York.						
	1 COMPLAINT						

- 3. Defendant ECKO COMPLEX, LLC d/b/a ECKO UNLIMITED ("Ecko") is a limited liability company organized and existing, on information and belief, under the law of the State of New York, with its principal place of business at, on information and belief, 40 West 23rd Street, 6th Floor, New York New York. On information and belief, Ecko is a subsidiary of IP Holdings.
- 4. Defendant MIZCO INTERNATIONAL, LLC ("Mizco") is a limited liability company organized and existing, on information and belief, under the laws of the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business at, on information and belief, 80 Essex Avenue East, Avenel New Jersey. On information and belief, Mizco is a licensee of IP Holdings.
- 5. The Accused Products are sold under the defendant Ecko's name, ECKO UNLTD., and states they are made by Mizco under license from IP Holdings. IP Holdings is the registrant of shopecko.com, which sells the Accused Products.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 6. This is a civil action for design patent infringement arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. sections 1 et seq. Subject matter jurisdiction is therefore proper under 28 U.S.C. sections 1331 and 1338(a). This is also an action for trademark and trade dress infringement and unfair competition under the Lanham Act and thus jurisdiction is proper under 15 U.S.C. section 1121.
- 7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claims and causes of action asserted in this complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) because this dispute is between citizens of complete diversity, including a New York company and a California company, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 8. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. sections 1391(b) and (c) and 1400(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in the district; plaintiff resides in this district; and the defendants reside in this district by virtue of being subject to personal jurisdiction in this judicial district by, among others, their repeatedly availment and direction of their activity toward this district, and engaging in acts of infringement in this judicial district.

# 

6 · 7

### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 9. Through heavy investment and hard work, Zipbuds designed a unique type of headphone that is both useful and highly aesthetically pleasing. The design is so aesthetically pleasing and ornamental that Zipbuds pursued and obtained a design patent to protect against others who may wish to sell what an ordinary observer would view as the same product. A copy of that U.S. Design Patent, US D652,407 S, is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 1 ("'407 Patent"). The '407 Patent protects design features which are in addition to the trade dress protection afforded the particular trade dress Zipbuds selected and promoted to enhance its brand recognition.
- 10. In addition, Zipbuds sought to and did create distinct brand awareness by use of a trademark, adopting the strong and inherently distinctive trademark "ZIPBUDS" for its highly aesthetic ear phones featuring a zipper. To protect its trademark and provide notice to the public that the trademark was for its exclusive use, Zipbuds sought and successfully obtained federal registration of its ZIPBUDS trademark for use in connection with "audio headphones." A copy of that U.S. Trademark, Reg. No. 4,115,616, is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 2 ("ZIPBUDS" and "ZIPBUDS Trademark").
- as early as November 9, 2010, and has gained significant market recognition. In 2011 alone, over \$1.5 million in sales of the ZIPBUDS earphones were made by Zipbuds, including through their website and the far-reaching Amazon.com website. The colorful, high-quality ear buds have become known for their quality and superior product design. By 2012, the ZIPBUDS earphones won Travel & Leisure's best personal gadget award. They have been featured extensively in the media, including gizmag.com (<a href="http://www.gizmag.com/zipbuds-keep-tangles-at-bay/17337/">http://www.gizmag.com/zipbuds-keep-tangles-at-bay/17337/</a>), C-Net (<a href="http://reviews.cnet.com/headphones/zipbuds-by-dga-tangle/4505-7877\_7-34221397.html">http://www.prnewswire.com/headphones/zipbuds-by-dga-tangle/4505-7877\_7-34221397.html</a>), PRnewswire.com (<a href="http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/zipbuds-introduces-2nd-generation-of-tangle-resistant-earphones-featuring-higher-quality-sound-and-enhanced-functionality-130763828.html</a>), among other sites. These products have been recognized for their innovation, and also their successful refinement of a zipper earphone.

- 12. Unfortunately, in the midst of this momentous success, Zipbuds discovered that Defendants started manufacturing and selling a competing earphone that infringes the trademark, trade dress and design patent of Zipbuds. While Zipbuds is a focused, product-driven company for its ear phones, Ecko is a mega company that was founded in (on information and belief) 1993 and sells a large variety of products from clothing, to watches, to electronic accessories, to cologne, and beyond. It brands itself as a "full-scale global fashion and lifestyle company" that has been "the leading face of global youth culture since 1993." They claim they are "omnipresent...from music videos and television programs to catwalks, action sports, and video games" and have "expanded to include t-shirts, denim jeans, hoodies, footwear, watches, hats, bags, and more." *See* http://www.shopecko.com/corp/index.jsp?clickid=about.
- 13. Defendants have begun sales of their product under the Ecko Unltd. brand produced by Mizco International, Inc. as (on information and belief) a licensee of IP Holdings, and included Ecko's Ecko Unltd. branding on the packaging and product. They placed their product on their official store website, shopecko.com, a website registered to Defendant IP Holdings.
- 14. Not only is Defendants' product a copy of Zipbuds' valuable patented design, it is also marketed on the shopecko.com website (on information and belief, Ecko's official website) as "ZIP EAR BUDS," including under the product code EKU-ZIP-GLD and barcode 58302 64207 (collectively, "Accused Product" or "Accused Products"), which was then listed on Amazon.com for sale under the trademark "ZIP EARBUD." The use of this mark by Defendants is likely to cause confusion as it is used on the same earphone products as Zipbuds uses its ZIPBUDS trademark, and is identical to Zipbuds' trademark except for the insertion of the very descriptive word "ear" in the middle.
- 15. The Accused Product also infringes the design of the '407 Patent and the trade dress of the ZIPBUDS earphones that utilize that valuable design. The '407 Patent was issued after review of relevant prior art, and found to be a novel design for earphones. As with the '407 Patent, the Accused Product does not begin its zipper feature immediately, but only does so partially up the chord from the ear phone plug. Additionally, the base from which the zipper extends is shaped with a flattened conical shape, as is present in the '407 Patent and ZIPBUDS. The Accused Products are

- 16. When Zipbuds learned of this infringement, it promptly contacted Defendants and demanded that they cease sales on September 16, 2011. The cease and desist letter identified the exact product, stated the bases by which it was violating Zipbuds' rights, and demanded that the sales of the Accused Product immediately cease.
- 17. Defendants did not stop sales, but instead responded on October 18, 2011, stating to the effect that they were comfortable with their sales and did not intend to stop. On November 21, 2011, Zipbuds responded with a letter further detailing the many ways that Defendants had engaged in infringement of Zipbuds' various intellectual property rights, explained the design and trade dress bases with specificity, and dispelled the many excuses given for why it was acceptable for Defendants to continue their sales. This removed any lingering excuse Defendants had for still believing they could somehow legitimately continue sales without willfully violating Zipbuds' intellectual property.
- 18. Over the next several months, counsel for Zipbuds and Defendants remained in contact but Defendants never stopped selling the Accused Products. Zipbuds requested information on sales data, but Defendants ignored the request. Sales of the Accused Products also continued after Defendants were provided notice of the issuance of the '407 Patent.

19. Zipbuds discovered on further inquiry that, not only had Defendants refused to stop sales, but their sales in fact include many other channels of trade that Zipbuds was not previously aware. This includes Wal-Mart, Sears, and Best Buy (at least, via their online store sites). This flooding of the market through major retailers has created, on information and belief, reverse confusion in addition to the forward confusion that has resulted to those already familiar with ZIPBUDS products.

### FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### **INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT NO. D652,407 S**

- 20. Zipbuds realleges all allegations in this Complaint as if stated herein.
- 21. On January 17, 2012, United States Patent Number D652,407 S ('407 Patent) entitled "Zippered Earphones," was duly and legally issued to Zipbuds, who has the right to enforce this patent. A true and correct copy of this Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by reference.
- 22. Defendants have infringed and continue to infringe the '407 Patent by making, using, selling, offering for sale, importing, and/or actively inducing others to use products that infringe one or more of the patented design(s) in the '407 Patent, and are thus liable for patent infringement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 271. This includes the practice by Defendants via the Accused Product, sold under the name ZIP EARBUD or ZIP EARBUDS, which infringes claim 1 of the '407 Patent.
- 23. Defendants' infringement of the '407 Patent has caused and continues to cause damage to Zipbuds in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 24. Defendants' infringement of the '407 Patent has caused and will continue to cause immediate and irreparable harm to Zipbuds for which there is no adequate remedy at law, unless this Court enjoins and restrains such activities.
- 25. Zipbuds is informed and believes and, on that bases alleges, that Defendants knew of the '407 Patent and that Defendants' infringement of the '407 Patent was willful and deliberate, entitling Zipbuds to enhanced damages pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 284, and costs incurred prosecuting this action.

2

## TR

3

45

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

1516

17

18

19 20

21

2223

25

24

2627

28

### SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

### TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

(15 U.S.C. § 1114 et seq.)

- 26. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all other paragraphs contained in this Complaint.
- 27. Plaintiff is the owner of the ZIPBUDS trademark, recorded on the United States Principal Register as U.S. Trademark Reg. No. 4,115,616.
- 28. Defendants have used this mark or a substantially similar mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution or advertising of goods and services, specifically the Accused Product.
- 29. On information and belief, such sales knowingly and willfully infringed Zipbuds' ZIPBUDS mark, constituting clear trademark infringement, both direct and vicarious.
- 30. Defendants' use of the infringing mark has caused significant confusion in the marketplace, is likely to cause both confusion and mistake, and is likely to deceive, as the marks are virtually identical in sound, appearance and meaning, and the goods are directly competitive.
- 31. On information and belief, such use was done willfully and with knowledge that such use would or was likely to cause confusion and deceive others, such intent clearly being made known as of receipt of the first cease and desist letter.
- 32. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' trademark infringement, Zipbuds has been damaged within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1114 *et seq*.
- 33. Zipbuds has suffered damages in an amount to be established after proof at trial or in the statutory amount.
- 34. Zipbuds is further entitled to disgorge Defendants' profits for its willful sales and unjust enrichment.
- 35. This case qualifies as an "exceptional case" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a) in that Defendants' acts were malicious, fraudulent, deliberate and willful, and taken in bad faith.

4 5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

36. Zipbuds' remedy at law is not adequate to compensate for injuries inflicted by Defendants. Accordingly, Zipbuds is entitled to temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief.

### THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

## TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT; TRADE DRESS INFRINGEMENT; UNFAIR **COMPETITION**

(15 U.S.C. § 1125 et seq. and Common Law)

- Plaintiff incorporates by reference all other paragraphs contained in this Complaint. 37.
- Plaintiff owns the trademark rights to ZIPBUDS by virtue of its long and continuous 38. use, and also has obtained trade dress rights in the trade dress of the ZIPBUDS.
  - Defendants have committed proscribed acts of unfair competition. 39.
- Defendants have sold and offered for sale counterfeit goods, as alleged above, falsely 40. designating their origin. This includes both trademark infringement and trade dress infringement of the ZIPBUDS, as alleged above.
  - On information and belief, Defendants' unfair competition was knowing and willful. 41.
- Defendants' uses are likely to cause confusion and mistake with the public and 42. deceive them into believing that there is an affiliation, connection and association between Defendant and Zipbuds.
- 43. Defendants' use, on information and belief, has also resulted in a likelihood of reverse confusion of those in the relevant markets previously unfamiliar with Zipbuds or who have come to believe Defendants are the senior users.
- 44. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Zipbuds has suffered and continues to suffer substantial pecuniary losses and irreparable injury to its business reputation and goodwill. As such, Zipbuds' remedy at law is not adequate to compensate for injuries inflicted by Defendants. Accordingly, Zipbuds is entitled to temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief.
- 45. By reason of such wrongful acts, Zipbuds is and was, and will be in the future, deprived of, among others, the profits and benefits of business relationships, agreements, and

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

transactions with various existing clients and/or prospective clients and customers. Defendants have wrongfully obtained said profits and benefits. Zipbuds is entitled to compensatory damages and disgorgement of Defendants' said profits, in an amount to be proven at trial, along with other just damages.

### FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

#### **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

### (California Common Law)

- Plaintiff incorporates by reference all other paragraphs contained in this Complaint. 46.
- Plaintiff has the exclusive right to use the trademark ZIPBUDS by virtue of its 47. extensive and continuous use, and also as evidenced by its formation of Zipbuds, LLC with the state of California.
  - 48. Defendants have committed unlawful acts of unfair competition, as alleged above.
- 49. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Zipbuds has suffered and continues to suffer substantial pecuniary losses and irreparable injury to its business reputation and goodwill. As such, Zipbuds' remedy at law is not adequate to compensate for injuries inflicted by Defendants. Accordingly, Zipbuds is entitled to temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief.
- By reason of such wrongful acts, Zipbuds is and was, and will be in the future, 50. deprived of, among others, the profits and benefits of business relationships, agreements, and transactions with various existing clients and/or prospective clients and customers. Defendants have wrongfully obtained said profits and benefits. Zipbuds is entitled to compensatory damages and disgorgement of Defendants' said profits, in an amount to be proven at trial, along with other just damages.
- Such acts, as alleged above, were done with malice, oppression and/or fraud, thus 51. entitling Zipbuds to exemplary and punitive damages.

1 FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF 2 STATUTORY UNFAIR COMPETITION 3 (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.) 4 52. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all other paragraphs contained in this Complaint. 5 53. Defendants have committed proscribed acts of unfair competition, as alleged above. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Zipbuds has suffered 6 54. 7 and continues to suffer substantial pecuniary losses and irreparable injury to its business reputation 8 and goodwill. As such, Zipbuds remedy at law is not adequate to compensate for injuries inflicted 9 by Defendants. Accordingly, Zipbuds is entitled to temporary, preliminary and permanent 10 injunctive relief. 11 55. By reason of such wrongful acts, Zipbuds is and was, and will be in the future, 12 deprived of, among others, the profits and benefits of business relationships, agreements, and 13 transactions with various existing clients and/or prospective clients and customers. As a result, 14 Zipbuds is entitled to restitutionary relief in an amount to be determined upon proof at the time of 15 trial. 16 PRAYER 17 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands the following relief: 18 1. A judgment in favor of Plaintiff Zipbuds and against Defendants on all counts; 19 2. A preliminary and permanent injunction from design patent, trademark and trade 20 dress infringement, and unfair business practices by Defendants; 21 3. Damages in an amount to be determined at trial, including Defendants' unjust 22 enrichment, such damages enhanced and/or trebled for willful infringement; 23 4. Statutory damages; 24 5. Exemplary and punitive damages; 25 5. Pre-judgment interest at the legally allowable rate on all amounts owed; 6. 26 Costs, expenses and fees under, among others, 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)-(b);

27

28

7.

Restitution;

## Case 3:12-cv-00768-IEG-DHB Document 1 Filed 03/29/12 Page 11 of 13 Attorney's fees under, among others, 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a) as an exceptional case and 8. § 1117(b) for willful use of a counterfeit mark; and 9. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper. **DEMAND FOR JURY** Zipbuds demands trial by jury on all issues triable as a matter of right at law. MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY & POPEO Dated: March 29, 2012 By: s/Andrew D. Skale Andrew D. Skale, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff, ZIPBUDS, LLC. 6304282v.1

**COMPLAINT** 

### Case 3:12-cv-00768-IEG-DHB Document 1 Filed 03/29/12 Page 12 of 13

SJS 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 INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
ZIPBUDS, LLC		MIZCO INTERNATIONAL, LLC, et al.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nam Andrew D. Skale, Mir	e, Address, and Telephone Number) ntz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky & Popeo P	С	LAND I		SE THE LOCATION OF THE  /0768 MMAPOR  Green Genovese & Gluck PO
3580 Carmel Mounta	in Rd., Ste. 300, SD, CA 92130 (858) 314	4-1500	875 Third Ave New York, New Y	ork 10022	
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P		(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	ı	(For Diversity Cases Only) P1 en of This State	FS DEF  Incorporated or Prof Business In Thi	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity  (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citize	en of Another State	2	
			en or Subject of a  reign Country	3 🗖 3 Foreign Nation	
	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
CONTRACT	TORTS  PERSONAL INHERY PERSONAL INHEE		ORFEITURE/PENALTY  O Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY  422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES  400 State Reapportionment
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Slander 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 370 Other Fraud Liability 371 Truth in Lending 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag	62   62   62   63   64   65   65   66   67   71   69   72   73   79   79   79   79   79   79   79	0 Agriculture 0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws 0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health 0 Other  LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 0 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 0 Railway Labor Act 0 Other Litigation 1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act  IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 3 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee 5 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157  PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights ■ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark  SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIW W (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	400 State Reapportionment   410 Antitrust   430 Banks and Banking   450 Commerce   460 Deportation   470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations   480 Consumer Credit   490 Cable/Sat TV   810 Selective Service   850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange   875 Customer Challenge   12 USC 3410   890 Other Statutory Actions   891 Agricultural Acts   892 Economic Stabilization Act   893 Environmental Matters   894 Energy Allocation Act   900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice   950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
<b>№</b> 1 Original	an "X" in One Box Only) emoved from			ferred from	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON    Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you want you will be a statute under which you want you want you will be a statute under which you want you wa				st
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:			EMAND \$ Exceeds \$75,000		y if demanded in complaint: 9: <b>Ø</b> Yes ☐ No
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	SE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A			1,2	
03/29/2012 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	Andrew D. Sk	ale, Esq	i. (9	NIK	
RECEIPT#	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	JDGE

### 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: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- 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.