1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Gregory L. Weeks, Esq., CSB No. 58584 Email: gweeks@wknjlaw.com Gregory K. Nelson, Esq., CSB No. 203029 Email: gnelson@wknjlaw.com Chandler G. Weeks, Esq., CSB No. 245503 Email: chandlerw@wknjlaw.com WEEKS, KAUFMAN, NELSON & JOHNSON 462 Stevens Avenue, Suite 310 Solana Beach, CA 92075 Telephone: (858) 794-2140 Fax: (858) 794-2141 Email: Office@wknjlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff	I								
9 10 11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA									
12										
14 15	RED.COM, INC., dba RED DIGITAL CINEMA, a Washington Corporation, Plaintiff, vs. WOODEN CAMERA, LLC, a Texas limited liability corporation, Defendant.	Case No.: '12CV1336 WQHRBB' COMPLAINT FOR PATENT								
16 17 18		INFRINGEMENT, TRADE DRESS INFRINGEMENT, AND UNFAIR COMPETITION AND FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL								
19 20)))								
21 22)								
23 24										
2526										
27 28										

Complaint

Plaintiff Red.com, Inc. dba Red Digital Cinema (hereinafter referred to as "RED") hereby complains of Defendant Wooden Camera, LLC (hereinafter referred to as "Wooden"), and alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Jurisdiction over this action is founded upon 15 U.S.C. § 1121, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
- 2. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) and 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b). The Defendant has sold infringing products in this district, attempted to pass off infringing products in this district, has directed sales and marketing efforts toward this district and/or own or operate retail stores in this judicial district and/or on the internet and selling in this district at its website below.

THE PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff RED is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Washington, having its principal place of business at 34 Parker, Irvine, California 92618, and doing business within this judicial district.
- 4. RED is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant Wooden Camera, LLC is a Texas limited liability corporation doing business at 1042 West 43rd Street, Houston, Texas 77018, and is doing business within this judicial district at least on its website, www.woodencamera.com. RED is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendant has been offering to sell, advertising and selling products, including the accused products identified below, directly and in the stream of commerce knowing such products would be sold in California and in this judicial district.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

5. Since at least 2005, RED has been and continues to be actively engaged in the design, development, manufacture and sale of high performance digital still and motion cinematography cameras, video equipment and accessories, digital editing software, video players and generally, imaging format technology used in the dissemination, broadcast, or transmission of video. Since the introduction of its revolutionary RED ONE® camera, RED's

products have been used to film several blockbuster movies, as well as many other movies and television series. The RED camera and products have been one of the hottest items in the Hollywood industry.

- 6. RED introduced its EPIC and SCARLET cameras in the past few years. Attendant with these two cameras, RED has also designed and introduced unique accessory components for the cameras. The accessories are unique in their styling and look, reminiscent of an industrial/military look. Because of their unique styling and successful sales, these products have become uniquely identifiable as having originated from RED.
- 7. RED is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendant WOODEN manufactures, imports, advertises, offers for sale and/or sells digital cinema camera accessories specifically designed to knock-off the look of RED's accessories and engage with the RED EPIC and SCARLET cameras.

PATENT INFRINGEMENT FACTS

- 8. RED is the owner by assignment of U.S. Patent No. D654,110, duly and lawfully issued on February 7, 1995, describing and claiming the invention entitled "Camera Component." A correct copy of U.S. Patent No. D654,110 is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
- 9. RED is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges that Defendant WOODEN is selling a digital cinema camera accessory that unlawfully embodies the claimed subject matter of U.S. Patent No. D654,110. In particular, RED alleges that Defendant's "A-Lock" mount for Quick Back and REDmote embodies the subject matter claimed in RED's design patent referred to above without any license thereunder and is thereby infringing the patent. RED is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that Defendant made, used, imported, advertised, offered for sale and/or sold its accused accessory to multiple distributors, retailers, and/or retail customers.
- 10. Defendant has received written notice of RED's proprietary rights in its patents by way of a cease and desist letter it caused to be sent to Defendant. Further, Defendant has received constructive notice of RED's patents as RED caused its patents to be placed plainly on the product and/or packaging. Despite actual and constructive knowledge, Defendant continues

 to infringe RED's patent rights. On information and belief, such infringement by Defendant must have been willful and wanton.

- 11. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the sale of the unauthorized, infringing camera accessory has resulted in lost sales, reduced the business and profit of RED, and greatly injured the general reputation of RED due to the inferior quality of the copies, all to RED's damage in an amount not yet fully determined.
- 12. The exact amount of profits realized by Defendant as a result of its infringing activities, are presently unknown to RED, as are the exact amount of damages suffered by RED as a result of said activities. These profits and damages cannot be accurately ascertained without an accounting.

TRADE DRESS FACTS

- 13. RED has expended substantial sums of money in the promotion of its EPIC, SCARLET, and related accessory lines of products. As a result of RED's promotional efforts, the distinctive look and feel of the RED accessories have become and are now widely known and recognized in this district and elsewhere as emanating from and authorized by RED. RED's accessory lines for its EPIC and SCARLET cameras are inherently distinctive in appearance, and has become, through widespread public acceptance, a distinctive designation of the source of origin of goods offered by RED and an asset of incalculable value as a symbol of RED and its quality goods and good will.
- 14. RED is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that the Defendant specifically designed, manufactured, packaged, advertised, displayed and sold expressly to profit from the demand created by RED for its inherently distinctive configurations of its accessories for its digital cinema cameras. In particular, RED's V-Mount, DSMC® Tactical Ribcage, DSMC® Tactical Cage, DSMC® Universal Mount (15mm and 19mm) and Swat Rail are uniquely designed and styled with the RED design language to engage with the RED cameras. RED is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that the following products are designed, made, offered for sale, and/or sold by Defendant to mimic the same designs and benefit financially from the success of the RED products: "A-Lock" (which "replicates the "A" on the

back of the camera"), "Nato Cage" (2 arms and 4 arms), "Nato Cage +" (19mm and 15mm), "Cheese Cage," "Cheese Cage +" (19mm and 15mm), "Ultimate Top Mount" (15mm and 19mm), "Tiny-versal 15mm Studio," "Tiny-versal 19mm," and "Safety NATO Rail."

- 15. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendant has advertised its RED accessory copies via its website and by way of other media. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that said advertising has drawn RED customers away from RED's website and its retailers, thereby causing damage to RED.
- 16. RED is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that Defendant's copy accessories are inferior products to authentic RED camera accessories. As a result, RED has been damaged significantly in the digital cinema accessory market. RED contends and believes that its image and the reputation of its products has been tarnished and diminished by Defendant's sale of RED copy sunglasses of inferior quality.
- 17. RED is further informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the presence of Defendant's copies in the marketplace damages the value of RED's exclusive rights. The presence of the copies in the marketplace is likely to diminish the apparent exclusivity of genuine RED products thereby dissuading potential customers who otherwise would have sought inherently distinctive RED sunglass designs. Upon information and belief, RED alleges that such deception has misled, and continues to mislead, and confuse many purchasers to buy the products sold by Defendant and/or has misled non-purchasers to believe the copies emanate from or are authorized by RED.
- 18. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Defendant's sale of the allegedly infringing accessory copies has resulted in lost sales, has reduced the business and profit of RED, and has greatly injured the general reputation of RED due to the inferior quality of the copies, all to RED's damage in an amount not yet fully determined.
- 19. The exact amount of profits realized by Defendant as a result of its infringing activities, are presently unknown to RED, and neither are the exact amount of damages suffered by RED as a result of these activities. These profits and damages cannot be accurately

...

.

26

27

28

3

45

6 7

9

8

10 11

1	2

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25

2627

28

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Trade Dress Infringement

- 28. RED realleges paragraphs 1 through 19 as though set forth fully at this point.
- 29. This is an action for trade dress infringement and false designation of origin pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) against Defendant Wooden.
 - 30. Jurisdiction is founded upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
- 31. Since 2010, RED has marketed and sold RED-styled accessories for its cameras. The configuration of RED's V-Mount is distinctive and well-recognized by the industry and consumers as emanating from RED. The RED accessories identified above have enjoyed enormous commercial success, which is expected to continue, and have become, through wide-spread recognition, an indicator of RED as the source of the products.
- 32. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the Defendant's advertising and sale of copies of RED's V-Mount configuration constitutes trade dress infringement and unfair competition, as a false designation of origin, a false description or representation of goods, and false representation to the consuming public that the Defendant's sunglasses originated from or somehow are authorized by or affiliated with RED.
- 33. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the actions of Defendant was done willfully, knowingly and maliciously with the intent to trade upon the good will of RED and to injure RED.
- 34. The Defendant's acts are in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (a) and will continue to the great and irreparable injury of RED until enjoined by this Court.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF Trade Dress Infringement

- 35. RED realleges paragraphs 1 through 19 as though set forth fully at this point.
- 36. This is an action for trade dress infringement and false designation of origin pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) against Defendant Wooden.
 - 37. Jurisdiction is founded upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
- Since 2010, RED has marketed and sold RED-styled accessories for its cameras. The configuration of RED's DSMC[®] Tactical Ribcage is distinctive and well-recognized by the

industry and consumers as emanating from RED. The RED accessories identified above have enjoyed enormous commercial success, which is expected to continue, and have become, through wide-spread recognition, an indicator of RED as the source of the products.

- 38. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the Defendant's advertising and sale of copies of RED's DSMC® Tactical Ribcage configuration constitutes trade dress infringement and unfair competition, as a false designation of origin, a false description or representation of goods, and false representation to the consuming public that the Defendant's sunglasses originated from or somehow are authorized by or affiliated with RED.
- 39. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the actions of Defendant was done willfully, knowingly and maliciously with the intent to trade upon the good will of RED and to injure RED.
- 40. The Defendant's acts are in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (a) and will continue to the great and irreparable injury of RED until enjoined by this Court.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF Trade Dress Infringement

- 41. RED realleges paragraphs 1 through 19 as though set forth fully at this point.
- 42. This is an action for trade dress infringement and false designation of origin pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) against Defendant Wooden.
 - 43. Jurisdiction is founded upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
- 44. Since 2010, RED has marketed and sold RED-styled accessories for its cameras. The configuration of RED's DSMC® Tactical Cage is distinctive and well-recognized by the industry and consumers as emanating from RED. The RED accessories identified above have enjoyed enormous commercial success, which is expected to continue, and have become, through wide-spread recognition, an indicator of RED as the source of the products.
- 45. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the Defendant's advertising and sale of copies of RED's DSMC® Tactical Cage configuration constitutes trade dress infringement and unfair competition, as a false designation of origin, a false description or representation of goods, and false representation to the consuming public that the Defendant's sunglasses originated from or somehow are authorized by or affiliated with RED.

46. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the actions of Defendant was done willfully, knowingly and maliciously with the intent to trade upon the good will of RED and to injure RED.

47. The Defendant's acts are in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (a) and will continue to the great and irreparable injury of RED until enjoined by this Court.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF Trade Dress Infringement

- 48. RED realleges paragraphs 1 through 19 as though set forth fully at this point.
- 49. This is an action for trade dress infringement and false designation of origin pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) against Defendant Wooden.
 - 50. Jurisdiction is founded upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
- 51. Since 2010, RED has marketed and sold RED-styled accessories for its cameras. The configuration of RED's DSMC® Universal Mount (15mm and 19mm) is distinctive and well-recognized by the industry and consumers as emanating from RED. The RED accessories identified above have enjoyed enormous commercial success, which is expected to continue, and have become, through wide-spread recognition, an indicator of RED as the source of the products.
- 52. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the Defendant's advertising and sale of copies of RED's DSMC[®] Universal Mount (15mm and 19mm) configuration constitutes trade dress infringement and unfair competition, as a false designation of origin, a false description or representation of goods, and false representation to the consuming public that the Defendant's sunglasses originated from or somehow are authorized by or affiliated with RED.
- 53. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the actions of Defendant was done willfully, knowingly and maliciously with the intent to trade upon the good will of RED and to injure RED.
- 54. The Defendant's acts are in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (a) and will continue to the great and irreparable injury of RED until enjoined by this Court.

...

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

28

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF Trade Dress Infringement

- 55. RED realleges paragraphs 1 through 19 as though set forth fully at this point.
- 56. This is an action for trade dress infringement and false designation of origin pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) against Defendant Wooden.
 - 57. Jurisdiction is founded upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338.
- 58. Since 2010, RED has marketed and sold RED-styled accessories for its cameras. The configuration of RED's Swat Rail is distinctive and well-recognized by the industry and consumers as emanating from RED. The RED accessories identified above have enjoyed enormous commercial success, which is expected to continue, and have become, through wide-spread recognition, an indicator of RED as the source of the products.
- 59. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the Defendant's advertising and sale of copies of RED's Swat Rail configuration constitutes trade dress infringement and unfair competition, as a false designation of origin, a false description or representation of goods, and false representation to the consuming public that the Defendant's sunglasses originated from or somehow are authorized by or affiliated with RED.
- 60. RED is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the actions of Defendant was done willfully, knowingly and maliciously with the intent to trade upon the good will of RED and to injure RED.
- 61. The Defendant's acts are in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (a) and will continue to the great and irreparable injury of RED until enjoined by this Court.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Red.com, Inc. prays as follows:

- That Defendant Wooden Camera, LLC be adjudicated to have infringed RED's U.S. Patent No.D654,110, and that the patent is valid and enforceable and is owned by RED;
- That Defendant, its agents, servants, employees, and attorneys and all persons in active concert and participation with them, be forthwith preliminarily and thereafter permanently enjoined from making, using or selling any sunglass which infringe United States Patent No. D654,110;

- 3. For an assessment and award of damages against Defendant in an amount equal to RED's lost profits, Defendant's profits, or a reasonable royalty derived from Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's patent rights in U.S. Patent Nos. D654,110 pursuant to 35 USC §§ 284 and 289;
- That the Defendant Wooden Camera, LLC be adjudicated to have infringed RED's V-Mount trade dress, and that said trade dress rights are enforceable and owned by RED;
- That the Defendant Wooden Camera, LLC be adjudicated to have infringed RED's DSMC Tactical Ribcage trade dress, and that said trade dress rights are enforceable and owned by RED;
- That the Defendant Wooden Camera, LLC be adjudicated to have infringed RED's DSMC Tactical Cage trade dress, and that said trade dress rights are enforceable and owned by RED;
- 7. That the Defendant Wooden Camera, LLC be adjudicated to have infringed RED's DSMC Universal Mount (15mm and 19mm) trade dress, and that said trade dress rights are enforceable and owned by RED;
- That the Defendant Wooden Camera, LLC be adjudicated to have infringed RED's Swat Rail trade dress, and that said trade dress rights are enforceable and owned by RED;
- 9. That Defendant, its agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and all those persons in active concert or participation with Defendant, be forthwith preliminary and thereafter permanently enjoined from infringing RED's V-Mount, DSMC® Tactical Ribcage, DSMC® Tactical Cage, DSMC® Universal Mount (15mm and 19mm) and Swat Rail trade dress configurations;
- 10. For an assessment and award of damages against Defendant in an amount no less than RED's lost profits, Defendant's profits or a reasonable royalty for Defendant's infringement of RED's trade dress rights in its V-Mount, DSMC

1	Tactical Ribcage, DSMC Tactical Cage, DSMC Universal Mount (15mm and						
2	19mm) and Swat Rail products pursuant to 15 USC § 1125(a);						
3	11. For an order requiring Defendant to deliver up and destroy all infringing digital						
4	cinema camera accessories;						
5	12. That an award of reasonable costs, expenses, and attorney's fees be awarded						
6	against Defendant pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116(a) and 35 U.S.C. § 285; and						
7	13. That Defendant be directed to file with this court and serve upon RED within 30						
8	days after the service of the injunction, a report in writing under oath, setting forth						
9	in detail the manner and form in which Defendant has complied with the						
10	injunction.						
11							
12	DATED: June 1, 2012 WEEKS, KAUFMAN, NELSON & JOHNSON						
13							
14	/s/ Gregory K. Nelson						
15	Gregory K. Nelson Attorney for Plaintiff, Red.com, Inc.						
16							
17							
18	JURY DEMAND						
19	Plaintiff RED, Inc. hereby requests a trial by jury in this matter.						
20	DATED: June 1, 2012 WEEKS, KAUFMAN, NELSON & JOHNSON						
21							
22	/s/ Gregory K. Nelson Gregory K. Nelson						
23	Attorney for Plaintiff, Red.com, Inc.						
24							
25							
26							
27							

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 declere sheet.

the civil docket sheet. (SEE INS			u states ii	i september 1974, is requ	ifed for the use of the Clerk of	Court for the purpose of initiating		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS				
RED.COM, INC. dba RED DIGITAL CINEMA, a Washington corpo				WOODEN CAMERA, LLC, a Texas limited liability corporation				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Orange County, CA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES (ASES, USE THE LOCATION OF		
					'12CV1:	336 WQHRBB		
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Weeks, Kaufman, Nelson & Johnson 462 Stevens Avenue, Suite 310 Solana Beach, CA 92075				Attorneys (If Known)				
II. BASIS OF JURISD		n One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff)		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Citizen of This State \square 1 \square 1 Incorporated or Principal Place \square 4 \square 4 of Business In This State				
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	•		Citize	Citizen of Another State				
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	1	nly) RTS	FO	PRFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY □ 310 Airplane □ 315 Airplane Product Liability □ 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability Product Liability 368 Asbestos Persona Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Personal Property Damage 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability PRISONER PETITION 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	1	LABOR O Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Mgmt. Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Habeas Corpus Alien Detainee (Prisoner Petition) 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/DIWW (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	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 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 □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) 7 1 Original Proceeding State Court Appellate Court ORIGIN 4 Reinstated or Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify) (specify) Transferred from another district (specify)								
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 35 U.S.C. Sections 271 and 281 and 15 U.S.C. Section 1125(a) Brief description of cause: This is a case of patent and trademark infringement								
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23				EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint: X Yes		
VIII. RELATED CASI IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER			
ATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD								
06/01/2012 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		/s/ Gregory K.	Nelson					
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUI	OGE		

Print

Save As...

Reset