

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY  
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE INDIVIDUALS, CORPORATIONS,  
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES,  
PARTNERSHIPS AND UNINCORPORATED  
ASSOCIATIONS IDENTIFIED IN  
SCHEDULE “A” HERETO,

Defendants.

**Case No. 1:24-cv-12600**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis  
Magistrate Keri L. Holleb Hotaling**

HEARING DATE: February 4, 2025  
HEARING TIME: 9:45 AM CST

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Plaintiff hereby moves this Honorable Court for entry of a Preliminary Injunction (the “Motion”). The scope of the requested Preliminary Injunction is substantially identical to the Sealed Temporary Restraining Order (the “TRO”) entered January 17, 2025. [Dkt. No. 20]. On January 27, 2025, the online sales platform, eBay, provided the email addresses for the named Schedule “A” Defendants (the “Defendants”) so that Plaintiff could effectuate electronic service of process on them. Plaintiff effectuated electronic service of process on the Defendants on January 27, 2025 [Dkt. No. 22]. As such, Plaintiff’s Motion, for which notice will be provided, is properly submitted to the Court on a non-*ex parte* basis. Plaintiff will serve Defendants with a copy of this Motion, all supporting materials, and any Minute Order issued by the Court setting a hearing and/or response deadline for the Motion.

This Motion is made and based on the accompanying Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction, the Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn, Esq.

(the “Kuhn Decl.”), the Declaration of Liangjie Li (the “Li Decl.”), and any arguments of counsel entertained by the Court.

DATED: January 29, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**  
1540 West Warm Springs Road Ste. 100  
Henderson, NV 89014  
Tel: (702) 462-5973 Fax: (702) 553-3404  
Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 29th day of January 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, using the electronic case filing system. The electronic case filing system sent a “Notice of Electronic Filing” to the attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of this document by electronic means. Notice of this filing is provided to unrepresented parties for whom contact information has been provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <http://blointernetenforcement.com>.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY  
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE INDIVIDUALS, CORPORATIONS,  
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES,  
PARTNERSHIPS AND UNINCORPORATED  
ASSOCIATIONS IDENTIFIED IN  
SCHEDULE “A” HERETO,

Defendants.

**Case No. 1:24-cv-12600**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis  
Magistrate Keri L. Holleb Hotaling**

HEARING DATE: February 4, 2025  
HEARING TIME: 9:45 AM CST

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF’S  
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Plaintiff HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY CO. LIMITED (“Plaintiff”) submits this Memorandum of Law in support of its Motion for Preliminary Injunction (the “Motion”).

The Motion is supported by the pleadings and papers on file in this action, including the Motion for Temporary Restraining Order [Dkt. Nos. 11 through 11-8, 12, 13 and 14], the Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn, Esq. (the “Kuhn Decl.”), the Declaration of Liangjie Li (the “Li Decl.”), together with the arguments set forth herein and any oral argument by counsel entertained by the Court at the hearing set on this matter.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff’s Motion requests entry of a Preliminary Injunction after the hearing set for February 4, 2025. On January 27, 2025, the named Schedule “A” Defendants (the “Defendants”) for which the eBay online sales platform (the “Platform”) provided email addresses associated

with their storefronts/accounts were served electronically as authorized by the Temporary Restraining Order (the “TRO”) entered by the Court January 17, 2025, [Dkt. No. 20]. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 5.) As such, Plaintiff’s Motion is properly submitted to the Court on a non-*ex parte* basis.

Substantively, the Motion is based on Plaintiff’s demonstration of a high likelihood of success on the merits of its claims for relief, including its copyright infringement allegations based on direct, unauthorized copying of its federally registered copyright protected images, the fact that the company would clearly suffer irreparable harm absent entry of injunctive relief, because the balance of the hardships tips decidedly in the company’s favor, and granting the requested relief is in the public interest. *See, e.g., Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc. v. Jasso*, 927 F. Supp. 1075, 1076 (N.D. Ill. 1996). To date, Plaintiff has presented virtually identical grounds for the issuance of preliminary injunctive relief, and such relief has been granted, by numerous courts in this judicial district. *See, e.g., Hong Kong Leyuzhen Tech. Co., Ltd. v. The Individuals*, Case No. 1:24-cv-01807, Dkt. No. 63 (Kendall, C.J.); *Hong Kong Leyuzhen Tech. Co., Ltd. v. The Individuals*, Case No. 1:24-cv-02939, Dkt. No. 83 (Kennelly, J.); *Hong Kong Leyuzhen Tech. Co., Ltd. v. The Individuals*, Case No. 1:24-cv-03210, Dkt. No. 71 (Pacold, J.); *Hong Kong Leyuzhen Tech. Co., Ltd. v. The Individuals*, Case No. 1:24-cv-01652, Dkt. No. 30 (Daniel, J.); *Hong Kong Leyuzhen Tech. Co., Ltd. v. The Individuals*, Case No. 1:24-cv-01547, Dkt. No. 41 (Wood, J.); *Hong Kong Leyuzhen Tech. Co., Ltd. v. The Individuals*, Case No. 1:24-cv-01705, Dkt. No. 43 (Cummings, J.). Plaintiff believes these numerous prior decisions demonstrate the merits of the company’s current request for issuance of preliminary injunctive relief by this Court. Accordingly, and as argued below, Plaintiff asserts that the Court should grant the Motion and enter a Preliminary Injunction against the Defendants, which is consistent with its prior rulings.

**a. Plaintiff's Brand is Highly Successful and the Company Spends Considerable Funds in the United States to Protect and Promote It.**

This action involves enforcement of Plaintiff's "Rotita" brand ("Rotita"). (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 6; Li Decl. ¶¶ 4-5.) Rotita is an extremely well-known source of women's clothing in the United States and has been the subject of rampant counterfeit sales through online platforms such as Amazon, Temu, Alibaba, eBay, Walmart, and Aliexpress, which is at issue in this action. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 6; Li Decl. ¶¶ 4-5.) These are the six largest online retailers in the World – and Plaintiff does not sell its products through any one of them. (*Ibid.*) Rather, Plaintiff only sells its genuine Rotita brand products through its website (rotita.com). (*Ibid.*)

Plaintiff derives a significant amount of revenue from the sale of Rotita branded products in the United States. Plaintiff's estimated gross revenue from United States sales likely exceeds \$20,000,000 USD per year. (Li Decl. ¶ 6.) Of this amount, Plaintiff estimates that well over \$1,000,000 is derived from sales in the State of Illinois. (*Id.*) In sum, Plaintiff is a highly successful company that services a considerable number of patrons in the United States and, more specifically, in the State of Illinois.

Commensurate with these sales, Plaintiff spends a considerable amount of the operating capital in the United States to protect and promote the Rotita brand. Specifically, Plaintiff estimates that it spends anywhere from \$8,000,000 to \$12,000,000 USD each year to advertise its Rotita brand in the United States through such online advertising sources as Google Ads, Facebook, and Bing. (Li Decl. ¶ 6.) Furthermore, the company has spent more than \$80,000 in filing fees paid to the United States Copyright Office just to secure registration of copyright protected works being asserted in eleven (11) enforcement actions initiated in this judicial district. (*Id.*) Simply put, Plaintiff is an extremely successful company that earns millions of dollars from product sales in

the United States – including within the State of Illinois. (*Id.*) To do so, Plaintiff annually spends tens of millions of dollars advertising in the United States to promote the sale of its brand. (*Id.*)

Succinctly stated, Plaintiff simply will no longer tolerate the proliferation of counterfeit sales through the unauthorized use of its federally registered copyright images on online platforms through which it does not offer its genuine products. These counterfeit operators must be stopped. Otherwise, Plaintiff’s intellectual property rights, which it has paid significantly to secure, are worthless. (Li Decl. ¶ 6.)

**b. This Case is Part of a Multi-Action Copyright Enforcement Campaign.**

Plaintiff’s operative Complaint in this action is but one piece in a multi-action copyright enforcement campaign that seeks to dismantle a criminal network that operates through six (6) of the largest online retail platforms in existence and includes over 2,500 named Schedule “A” defendants in actions pending in this judicial district. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7.) This criminal network is alleged to have operated, and continue to operate, in concert promoting the sale of counterfeit or knockoff Rotita brand products by using the Company’s copyright protected product images to do so. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7; Li Decl. ¶ 7.)

More specifically, the named Defendants in this action are alleged to be engaged in the practice of directly, and intentionally, copying, without authorization, Plaintiff’s copyright protected product images almost instantaneously after they are first displayed on the company’s website and then associating these images on their storefronts maintained on the Platform in connection with the sale and promotion of counterfeit products of substandard quality, thereby deceiving consumers – including the citizens of the State of Illinois. (*Ibid.*) Moreover, given the nature of Plaintiff’s textile manufactured women’s clothing products, such large-scale counterfeit sales operations over multiple online retail platforms require considerable supply chain

coordination efforts that could not reasonably be accomplished independently by any of the named Defendants. (*Ibid.*) In fact, several Schedule “A” defendants and counsel in other pending copyright enforcement actions in this judicial district have asserted that they obtained both the unauthorized images and the counterfeit products from the same manufacturing source.<sup>1</sup> (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 9.)

In short, these counterfeit sales operations require one or more textile manufacturing factories, the sourcing of identical, counterfeit fabrics and patterns, distribution networks to fulfill retail orders for these counterfeit goods, and the end sellers needed to promote and solicit sales. (*Id.* ¶ 10.) Plaintiff’s copyright infringement allegations against the Defendants in this action, and in all other actions pending in this judicial district, simply could not be accomplished alone. (*Id.*) Rather, the level of counterfeit operations presented to this Court requires the Defendants to rely upon the same, coordinated, common black market manufacturing supply chain to successfully promote, sell, and fill the orders placed because of their infringing conduct. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 10; Li Decl. ¶ 7.)

**c. Plaintiff has Presented Substantial Evidence of Copyright Infringement.**

As previously presented to this Court in connection with the company’s amended request for entry of a temporary restraining order [Dkt. Nos. 18 through 18-8], Plaintiff has presented substantial evidence that Defendants have intentionally copied its copyright protected works. [*Id.*] This evidence includes a literal one-for-one copying of these protected works and their unauthorized display on Defendants’ online storefronts, which are offering substandard,

---

<sup>1</sup> In fact, defense counsel made this assertion before Judge Kennelly at in-person oral argument on Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment. *See Hong Kong Leyuzhen Tech. Co., Ltd. v. P’ships & Unincorporated Ass’ns Identified on Schedule “A”*, Case No. 1:24-cv-02939-MFK-BWJ [Dkt. No. 80.] In response, the Court specifically found that Plaintiff had satisfied the joinder requirements of Rule 20(a)(2) based on the presence of an alleged common manufacturing source. [*Id.*]



counterfeit products for sale to United States citizens, including those residing in the State of Illinois. [*Id.*] Substantively, this evidence clearly demonstrates that Plaintiff has an extremely high likelihood of success on the merits of its first amended copyright infringement claim, as well as its associated claims for false designation of origin and violation of Illinois' deceptive trade practices act. [Dkt. No. 16.]

As also previously argued to this Court in support of its request for entry of a temporary restraining order [Dkt. Nos. 10 through 10-8, 11, 13 through 13-1], Plaintiff would unquestionably suffer irreparable harm absent entry of injunctive relief through the spoliation of essential evidence and Defendants absconding with significant ill-gotten gains derived from their intentional infringement of Plaintiff's federally secured copyright protected works. These facts still exist today and support entry of preliminary injunctive relief effective until full adjudication of this matter. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 11; Li Decl. ¶ 10.) In fact, the presentation of virtually identical facts has resulted in Plaintiff being granted preliminary injunctive relief by the following judges, in this judicial district: (1) Chief Judge Kendall (Case No. 1:24-cv-01807); (2) Judge Pacold (Case No. 1:24-cv-03210); Judge Daniel (Case No. 1:24-cv-01652); (4) Judge Wood (Case No. 1:24-cv-01547); (5) Judge Cummings (Case No. 1:24-cv-01705). (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 12.) Plaintiff believes that these prior decisions granting preliminary injunctive relief is, at least, instructive in this Court's consideration of the Motion. Accordingly, as argued herein, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court further enjoin the Defendants through entry of a Preliminary Injunction.

**d. Procedural History**

On January 17, 2025, this Court granted Plaintiff's TRO request on an *ex parte* basis. [Dkt. No. 20]. Substantively, the TRO authorized and directed Plaintiff to provide notice of these proceedings and the preliminary injunction hearing to Defendants by electronically publishing a

link to the Complaint, the TRO, and other relevant documents on a website, together with effectuating electronic service by email transmission to any addresses provided for Defendants by third party online platforms. [Dkt. No. 20 ¶ 7.]

On January 27, 2025, the Platform produced the Defendants' email addresses and Plaintiff effectuated electronic service of process on January 27, 2025. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 5.)

Based on the foregoing procedural history, including having effectuated electronic service of process to the Defendants as required by the TRO, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court now enter a Preliminary Injunction in this matter after a hearing is conducted. Plaintiff further requests the Court issue a Minute Order setting a deadline for Defendants to submit any oppositions to the Motion prior to conducting a scheduled hearing. Plaintiff will immediately serve Defendants electronically with the requested Minute Order once it is issued by the Court. Substantively, as stated earlier, and as argued below, Plaintiff's request for issuance of a preliminary injunction is in full compliance with the applicable standards for granting such relief.

## **II. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS**

To be entitled to preliminary injunctive relief, the moving party must first show that it has (1) a reasonable likelihood of success on the merits of its claims for relief, and (2) that it would suffer irreparable harm absent entry of injunctive relief. *See Publications Int'l v. Meredith Corp.*, 88 F.3d 473, 478 (7th Cir. 1996).

If these threshold requirements are met by the moving party, the court then "exercise[s] its discretion whether the balance of the harms weighs in favor of the moving party or whether the nonmoving party or the public interest will be harmed sufficiently such that the injunction should be denied." *Christian Legal Soc'y v. Walker*, 453 F.3d 853, 859 (7th Cir. 2018). "This process involves engaging in what we term the sliding scale approach; the more likely the [moving party]

will succeed on the merits, the less the balance of irreparable harms need favor the [moving party's] position.” *Ty, Inc. v. Jones Group, Inc.*, 237 F.3d 891, 895 (7th Cir. 2001).

Application of the foregoing legal standards to Plaintiff's Motion demonstrates that it is entitled to entry of a Preliminary Injunction.

### **III. ARGUMENT**

Plaintiff's Motion essentially asks the Court to enter a Preliminary Injunction after having granted it prior request for entry of the TRO. [Dkt. No. 20] Courts in this judicial district addressing similar allegations of Internet-based intellectual property infringement and associated counterfeiting activity have issued preliminary injunctive relief after entering a temporary restraining order. *See, e.g., Alicia Vannoy Call v. The P'ships*, No. 23-cv-04043 (N.D. Ill. July 25, 2023) (unpublished). Moreover, Plaintiff has already be granted injunctive relief on essentially the same facts presented to this Court in actions pending before the following judges in this judicial district: (1) Chief Judge Kendall (Case No. 1:24-cv-01807); (2) Judge Pacold (Case No. 1:24-cv-03210); Judge Daniel (Case No. 1:24-cv-01652); (4) Judge Wood (Case No. 1:24-cv-01547); (5) Judge Cummings (Case No. 1:24-cv-01705). (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 12.) These circumstances aside, and as argued below, Plaintiff is independently entitled to entry of preliminary injunctive relief in this action based on the record presented.

#### **a. Plaintiff Has Demonstrated a High Likelihood of Success on The Merits.**

As demonstrated in through its TRO submissions, Plaintiff has a high likelihood of success on the merits of, at least, its copyright infringement claim for relief. [Dkt. Nos. 16 through 16-2, 18 through 18-8] In this regard, Plaintiff has shown the one-for-one unauthorized copying of its federally registered, copyright protected images. [*Id.*]

To prevail on a copyright infringement claim, a party must prove: (1) ownership of a valid copyright protected work; and (2) the unauthorized copying, display, or other use in violation of the exclusive rights granted to the owner under the Copyright Act. *See, e.g., Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991). “A certificate of registration from the U.S. Register of Copyrights constitutes *prima facie* evidence of validity of the copyright.” *Wildlife Exp. Corp. v. Carol Wright Sales, Inc.*, 18 F.3d 502, 507 (7th Cir. 1994).

Here, Plaintiff has submitted evidence to the Court demonstrating it holds copyright registrations over the images at issue in this action. [Dkt. No. 16-1.] This evidence includes further includes a list of the images covered by these copyright registrations, and a replication of the unauthorized images displayed by the Defendants on their online storefronts in connection with offering counterfeit Rotita products for sale on the Platform. [Dkt. No. 18-8.] This evidence, while it may be contested by one or more Defendants should they appear in this action, is highly persuasive evidence that Plaintiff stands a high likelihood of success on the merits of its copyright infringement claim. Accordingly, Plaintiff submits that it has more than satisfied the first element necessary of issuance of preliminary injunctive relief.

**b. Plaintiff would suffer irreparable harm absent entry of injunctive relief.**

Next, Plaintiff would unquestionably suffer irreparable harm is preliminary injunctive relief is not granted. In this regard, the Copyright Act expressly authorizes courts to issue “grant temporary and final injunctions on such terms as it may deem reasonable to prevent or restrain infringement of a copyright.” 17 U.S.C. § 502(a).

As with the issued TRO, Plaintiff requests issuance of the preliminary injunction to prevent the Defendants from using, without authorization, the company’s copyright protected images in connection with the manufacture, importation, distribution, offering for sale, and sale of counterfeit products. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 14.) This results in the direct harm to Plaintiff’s brand

reputation and loss of consumer goodwill, both of which are harms that are virtually impossible to ascertain the resulting economic loss (*Id.*; Li Decl. ¶ 10.) See *Life Spine, Inc. v. Aegis Spine, Inc.*, 8 F.4th 531, 546 (7th Cir. 2021); *Ty, Inc.*, 237 F.3d at 902. As such, these harms constitute irreparable harm. (*Ibid.*) Absent issuance of this requested preliminary injunctive relief, Defendants' intentional infringement of Plaintiff's federally secured rights will unquestionably continue. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 14.)

Plaintiff's demonstration of irreparable harm is also based the high likelihood that Defendants would delete links to their online stores, thereby erasing key evidence related to their online accounts such as product sales information and ill-gotten funds derived from their intentional infringement of the company's copyright protected works, that would otherwise be deleted, or transferred to unknown locales, unless they remain frozen until conclusion of this action. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 15.) This harm simply cannot be monetarily quantified and, as such, supports a finding of irreparable harm. See *Graphic Design Marketing, Inc. v. Xtreme Enterprises, Inc.*, 772 F.Supp.2d 1029, 1034 (E.D. Wis. 2011). This same harm justified entry of the TRO and it continues to exist today, which clearly justifies entry of the requested preliminary injunction. (*Id.*) Simply put, absent granting the requested injunctive relief, Plaintiff would be irreparably harmed through Defendants' efforts to avoid enforcement of the company federally protected rights by this Court. (*Id.*; Li Decl. ¶ 10.)

**c. The Balance of The Hardships Tips Strongly in Favor of Plaintiff and Entry of Injunctive Relief is in The Public Interest.**

Having satisfied the first two requirements for issuance of preliminary injunctive relief, the next two inquiries presented consider the balance of the hardships between the Plaintiff and the parties being restrained, and whether the issuing the injunction would be in the public's interest.

See *Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc.*, 927 F. Supp. at 1076. Here, both factors support granting Plaintiff's Motion.

Turning first to the balance of the hardships, Plaintiff has demonstrated a direct copying of its federally registered copyright protected images. [Dkt. No. 18-8.] In fact, the evidence presented raises an extremely strong inference that Defendants have willfully infringed Plaintiff's copyright protected works. Under these circumstances, very little, if any, deference should be given to any hardships experienced by Defendants should injunctive relief be entered in Plaintiff's favor. Accordingly, the balance of the hardships tips strongly in Plaintiff's favor.

Likewise, issuance of the requested injunctive relief is in the public's interest. "The Copyright Act evidences a public interest in creativity by demonstrating an intent to provide an economic reward for creative expression." *Midway Mfg. Co. v. Artic Intern., Inc.*, 547 F.Supp. 999, 1015 (N.D. Ill. 1982). By granting Plaintiff's Motion, the Court would be furthering that interest by rewarding the company's development and dissemination of new styles, colors, and sizes of women's clothing, which is visually displayed through its advertising and marketing images such as those reflected in its copyright protected works in this action. (See Li Decl. ¶¶ 10-11.) On the other hand, there would be no public interest furthered by allowing Defendants to continue to distribute and sell their counterfeit products through the unauthorized use of Plaintiff's copyright protected images. Accordingly, the public's interest would be strongly served by granting Plaintiff's Motion.

#### **IV. The Current Bond is Sufficient to Protect Defendants' Interests.**

The Court has previously required Plaintiff to post a bond in the sum of \$26,000.00 in connection with issuance of the TRO. [Dkt. No. 20.] The exact same circumstances, if not more, supporting the Court's determination of this bond amount apply to Plaintiff's request for entry of a Preliminary Injunction. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 16.) Moreover, the Court is presented with facts and

supporting evidence that clearly demonstrates Defendants have infringed Plaintiff's copyright protected works. (*Id.*) This blatant, intentional conduct demonstrates that Plaintiff has an exceptionally high likelihood of success on the merits of its asserted claims for relief. *See Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc.*, 927 F. Supp. at 1076. Such a strong showing militates against a subsequent finding that injunctive relief was improperly granted. Accordingly, Plaintiff requests the Court maintain the current bond amount required for issuance of the TRO for issuance of the preliminary injunction.

## V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff will immediately serve Defendants with the hearing date for Preliminary Injunction, or any hearing date issued by the Court. Plaintiff additionally respectfully requests the Court grant its request for entry of a preliminary injunction and maintain the current bond amount required under the TRO, together with issuing any other relief that it deems just and proper.

DATED: January 29, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**  
1540 West Warm Springs Road Ste. 100  
Henderson, NV 89014  
Tel: (702) 462-5973 Fax: (702) 553-3404  
Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 29th day of January 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, using the electronic case filing system. The electronic case filing system sent a “Notice of Electronic Filing” to the attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of this document by electronic means. Notice of this filing is provided to unrepresented parties for whom contact information has been provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <http://blointernetenforcement.com>.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn

Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)

**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY  
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE INDIVIDUALS, CORPORATIONS,  
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES,  
PARTNERSHIPS AND UNINCORPORATED  
ASSOCIATIONS IDENTIFIED IN  
SCHEDULE "A" HERETO,

Defendants.

**Case No. 1:24-cv-12600**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis  
Magistrate Keri L. Holleb Hotaling**

HEARING DATE: February 4, 2025

HEARING TIME: 9:45 AM CST

**DECLARATION OF KATHERINE M. KUHN IN SUPPORT OF  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

I, Katherine M. Kuhn, of the City of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, declare as follows:

1. Except as otherwise expressly stated to the contrary, this declaration is based upon my personal knowledge of the following facts and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the statements made herein.

2. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (the "Motion").

3. I am an attorney at law, duly admitted to practice before the Courts of the State of Illinois and the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. I am lead counsel of for Plaintiff HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY CO. LIMITED ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration from my matters within my own personal knowledge unless stated otherwise.

4. Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (the "TRO") was granted by the Court on January 17, 2025. [Dkt. No. 20.]

5. On January 27, 2025, the designated online platform, eBay, (the "Platform") provided Plaintiff with the email addresses for the named Schedule "A" Defendants (the "Defendants") so that electronic service of process authorized under the TRO could be effectuated. After receiving the email addresses from the Platform, Plaintiff effectuated electronic service of process on the Defendants on January 27, 2025. Plaintiff believes that it has electronically served all Defendants subject to the TRO as of the filing of the Motion.

6. This action involves enforcement of Plaintiff's "Rotita" brand ("Rotita"). Rotita is an extremely well-known source of women's clothing in the United States and has been the subject of rampant counterfeit sales through online platforms such as Amazon, Walmart, Alibaba, Temu, eBay, and Aliexpress, which is at issue in this action. These are the six largest online retailers in the World – and Plaintiff does not sell its products through any one of them. Rather, Plaintiff only sells its genuine Rotita brand products through its website (rotita.com).

7. Plaintiff's operative Complaint in this action is but one piece in a multi-action copyright enforcement campaign that seeks to dismantle a criminal network that operates through six (6) of the largest online retail platforms in existence and includes over 2,700 named Schedule "A" Defendants. These named Schedule "A" Defendants are alleged to be engaged in the practice of copying Plaintiff's copyright protected product images almost instantaneously after they are first displayed on the company's website and then associating these images with sale and promotion of unauthorized, counterfeit products of substandard quality, thereby deceiving consumers – including the citizens of the State of Illinois. Moreover, given the nature of Plaintiff's goods, such large-scale sales operations over multiple online retail platforms require considerable

supply chain coordination that could not reasonably be accomplished independently by any of the named Defendants.

8. The sophistication of Defendants' online, counterfeit sales network is further demonstrated by the skill with which they identify Schedule "A" plaintiffs, their allegedly infringed products or brands, and then immediately disseminating this information throughout their network by posting on online websites such as "SellerDefense.cn." The dissemination of this information then immediately results in the named Defendants siphoning off all illicit funds held in their online accounts. This results in plaintiffs being deprived of any meaningful opportunity to redress the harm caused by Defendants' infringing conduct by attacking their financial resources.

9. Several Schedule "A" defendants and counsel in other pending copyright enforcement actions in this judicial district have asserted that they obtained both the unauthorized images and the counterfeit products from the same manufacturing source. In fact, defense counsel made this assertion before Judge Kennelly at in-person oral argument on Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction. *See Hong Kong Leyuzhen Tech. Co., Ltd. v. P'ships & Unincorporated Ass'ns Identified on Schedule "A"*, Case No. 1:24-cv-02939-MFK-BWJ [Dkt. No. 80.] In response, the Court specifically found that Plaintiff had satisfied the joinder requirements of Rule 20(a)(2) based on the presence of an alleged common manufacturing source. [*Id.*]

10. In short, these counterfeit sales operations require one or more textile manufacturing factories, the sourcing of identical, counterfeit fabrics and patterns, distribution networks to fulfill retail orders for these counterfeit goods, and the end sellers needed to promote and solicit sales. Plaintiff's copyright infringement allegations against the Defendants in this action, and in all other actions pending in this judicial district, simply could not be accomplished alone. Rather, the level of counterfeit operations presented to this Court requires the Defendants

to rely upon the same, coordinated, common black market manufacturing supply chain to successfully promote, sell, and fill the orders placed because of their infringing conduct.

11. As also previously argued to this Court in support of its request for entry of a temporary restraining order, Plaintiff would unquestionably suffer irreparable harm absent entry of injunctive relief through the spoliation of essential evidence and Defendants absconding with significant ill-gotten gains derived from their intentional infringement of Plaintiff's federally secured copyright protected works. These facts still exist today and support entry of preliminary injunctive relief effective until full adjudication of this matter.

12. In fact, the presentation of virtually identical facts has resulted in Plaintiff being granted preliminary injunctive relief by the following judges in this judicial district: (1) Chief Judge Kendall (Case Nos. 1:24-cv-01807 and 1:24-cv-03191); (2) Judge Pacold (Case No. 1:24-cv-03210); Judge Daniel (Case No. 1:24-cv-01652); (4) Judge Wood (Case No. 1:24-cv-01547); (5) Judge Cummings (Case No. 1:24-cv-01705); (6) Judge Jenkins (Case No. 1:24-cv-07702); (7) Judge Kennelly (Case Nos. 1:24-cv-02939 and 1:24-cv-07059); (8) Judge Bucklo (Case No. 1:24-cv-02825); and (9) Judge Alexakis (Case No. 1:24-cv-06226).

13. Substantively, the TRO authorized and directed Plaintiff to provide notice of these proceedings and the preliminary injunction hearing to Defendants by electronically publishing a link to the Complaint, the TRO, and other relevant documents on a website, together with effectuating electronic service by email transmission to any addresses provided for Defendants by third party online platforms. [Dkt. No. 20 ¶ 7.] Plaintiff has complied with these requirements by serving the designated online platform with a copy of the TRO and the related subpoena requesting information, including that required to effectuate electronic service, for the named Defendants.

14. As with the issued TRO, Plaintiff requests issuance of the preliminary injunction to prevent the Defendants from using, without authorization, the company's copyright protected images in connection with the manufacture, importation, distribution, offering for sale, and sale of counterfeit products. Absent issuance of this requested preliminary injunctive relief, Defendants' intentional infringement of Plaintiff's federally secured rights will unquestionably continue.

15. Plaintiff also requests conversion of the TRO to a preliminary injunction so that Defendants' online accounts, which contain essential illegal product sales information and ill-gotten funds derived from their intentional infringement of the company's copyright protected works that would otherwise be transferred to unknown locales, remain frozen until conclusion of this action. This same harm justified entry of the TRO and it continues to exist today, which clearly justifies entry of the requested preliminary injunction. Simply put, absent extending the relief granted under the TRO to a preliminary injunction, Plaintiff would be irreparably harmed through Defendants' efforts to avoid enforcement of the company federally protected rights by this Court.

16. The Court has previously required Plaintiff to post a bond in the sum of \$26,000.00 in connection with issuance of the TRO. [Dkt. No. 20 ¶ 9.] The exact same circumstances supporting the Court's determination of this bond amount apply to Plaintiff's request for entry of a preliminary injunction. Moreover, the Court is presented with facts and supporting evidence that clearly demonstrates Defendants have infringed Plaintiff's copyright protected works.

17. In *Volkswagen AG, et al. v. hkseller\*2011, et al.*, No. 18-cv-07621 (N.D. Ill. May 6, 2019), the Court found that the defendants deliberately evaded asset restraint. Despite assurances, defendants depleted their PayPal account before a hearing. When the restraint was reinstated, they swiftly withdrew \$20,000. With their counsel withdrawing and no response to

plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, a \$200,000 judgment was entered, which remains unpaid beyond the restrained funds.

18. In *PopSockets LLC v. Xuebo50, et al.*, No. 17-cv-06101 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 12, 2017), a defendant's PayPal account, initially holding \$1,611,921, was restrained. The account was released under the condition that several hundred thousand dollars, earmarked for potential consumer chargebacks, couldn't be withdrawn. However, due to a misunderstanding with PayPal, the defendant reduced the balance to \$36,469 upon receiving notice of the lawsuit. The defendant didn't appear in the case, resulting in a default judgment entered against them.

19. For these reasons, in the absence of issuance of the requested preliminary injunction, Defendants would likely move any assets from accounts in financial institutions subject to this Court's jurisdiction to offshore accounts outside of this Court's jurisdiction.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 29, 2025, in Chicago, Illinois.

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
KATHERINE M. KUHN, ESQ.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 29th day of January 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, using the electronic case filing system. The electronic case filing system sent a “Notice of Electronic Filing” to the attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of this document by electronic means. Notice of this filing is provided to unrepresented parties for whom contact information has been provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <http://blointernetenforcement.com>.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn

Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)

**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY  
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE INDIVIDUALS, CORPORATIONS,  
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES,  
PARTNERSHIPS AND UNINCORPORATED  
ASSOCIATIONS IDENTIFIED IN  
SCHEDULE "A" HERETO,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:24-cv-12600

Honorable Sara L. Ellis

Magistrate Keri L. Holleb Hotaling

**DECLARATION OF LIANGJIE LI**  
**IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

I, Liangjie Li, of Hong Kong, a special administrative region of the People's Republic of China, declare as follows:

1. Except as otherwise expressly stated to the contrary, this declaration is based upon my personal knowledge of the following facts and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the statements made herein.

2. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (the "Motion").

3. I am the Chief Operations Officer for Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Ltd. ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration from my matters within my own personal knowledge unless stated otherwise.



4. Plaintiff markets and sells women's clothing and related items under the "Rotita" brand name ("Rotita").

5. Rotita is an extremely well-known source of women's clothing in the United States and has been the subject of rampant counterfeit sales through online platforms such as Amazon, Temu, Alibaba, eBay, Walmart, and Aliexpress (the "Platform"), which is the online sales platform at issue in this action. These are the six largest online retailers in the World – and Plaintiff does not sell its products through any one of them. Rather, Plaintiff only sells its genuine Rotita brand products through its website rotita.com.

6. Plaintiff's rough estimated gross revenue from United States sales likely exceeds \$20,000,000 USD per year. Of this amount, Plaintiff roughly estimates that over \$1,000,000 is derived from sales in the State of Illinois. Moreover, Plaintiff spends roughly anywhere from \$8,000,000 to \$12,000,000 USD each year to specifically advertise its Rotita brand in the United States through such online advertising sources as Google Ads, Facebook, and Bing. Furthermore, the company has spent more than \$80,000 in filing fees paid to the United States Copyright Office just to secure registration of copyright protected works being asserted in, currently, thirteen (13) enforcement actions initiated in this judicial district. Simply put, Plaintiff is an extremely successful company that earns millions of dollars from product sales in the United States – including within the State of Illinois. To do so, Plaintiff annually spends tens of millions of dollars advertising in the United States to promote the sale of its brand.

7. The defendants named in the company's copyright infringement enforcement actions are engaged in the practice of copying Plaintiff's copyright protected product images almost instantaneously after they are first displayed on the company's website and then associating these images with sale and promotion of unauthorized, counterfeit products of substandard quality,

thereby deceiving consumers – including the citizens of the State of Illinois. Moreover, given the nature of Plaintiff’s goods, such large-scale sales operations over multiple online retail platforms require considerable supply chain coordination that could not reasonably be accomplished independently by any of the named Defendants. Simply put, Plaintiff maintains that Defendants are acting in concert, pursuant to a common scheme, whereby they independently copy the company’s copyright protected images, without authorization, from its website or such unauthorized images are being provided by the same common source associated with manufacturing the counterfeit products being sold on the Defendants’ Platform storefronts.

8. The sophistication of Defendants’ online, counterfeit sales network is further demonstrated by the skill with which they identify Schedule “A” plaintiffs, their allegedly infringed products or brands, and then immediately disseminating this information throughout their network by posting on online websites such as “SellerDefense.cn.” The dissemination of this information then immediately results in the named Defendants siphoning off all illicit funds held in their online accounts.

9. Defendants have directly targeted their counterfeit sales activities, through online sales platforms not utilized by Plaintiff, in the United States, including to the residents of the State of Illinois, through, at least, fully interactive, e-commerce stores operating under their designated aliases on the Platform.

10. Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, irreparable harm through the Defendants’ unauthorized use of its federally registered copyright protected images asserted in this action. This results in the direct harm to Plaintiff’s brand reputation and loss of consumer goodwill, both of which are harms that are virtually impossible to ascertain the resulting economic loss.

11. Plaintiff expects to earn a net profit of approximately 30% on the sale of its Rotita brand products. This figure, however, includes substantial advertising expenses that Defendants would not have to pay since they are largely capitalizing on Plaintiff's advertising efforts by misappropriating its copyright protected images and imbedding the term "Rotita" in their Amazon.com search engine optimization. Doing so causes their online stores to be displayed whenever someone searches for "Rotita" on Amazon.com despite Plaintiff not selling authentic "Rotita" brand products on the platform. Based on the foregoing, I would estimate that Defendants' online stores operate at a net profit of between 40% to 50%. I believe that a disgorgement of Defendants' profits would fall within the net profit range. It is my understanding that Plaintiff is currently awaiting the Platform's compliance with the Temporary Restraining Order and associated subpoena issued in this action that requires it to produce such sales information. Absent receipt of such information, Plaintiff is forced to assume that all sales made by Defendants through the Platform and all amounts held in their online accounts are the result of infringing activity in violation of the company's intellectual property rights.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 24, 2025, in Hong Kong.

By: Liangjie Li  
LIANGJIE LI

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 30th day of January 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, using the electronic case filing system. The electronic case filing system sent a “Notice of Electronic Filing” to the attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of this document by electronic means. Notice of this filing is provided to unrepresented parties for whom contact information has been provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <https://blointernetenforcement.com/>.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn

Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)

**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**

1540 West Warm Springs Road Ste. 100

Henderson, NV 89014

Tel: (702) 462-5973 Fax: (702) 553-3404

Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*