

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

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY  
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

Plus size Stephanie,

Defendant.

**Case No.: 1:25-cv-02957-JCD-KLHH**

**Honorable Jeremy C. Daniel**

**Magistrate Keri L. Holleb Hotaling**

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF  
DEFAULT JUDGMENT AGAINST DEFENDANT**

Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Ltd. ("Plaintiff") hereby moves for entry of Default Judgment against the Defendant, Plus Size Stephanie. Plaintiff files herewith a Memorandum of Law in support, Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn and Declaration of Liangjie Li. Plaintiff's Motion for entry of Default Judgment disposes of the case.

DATED: July 1, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Joseph W Droter

Joseph W. Droter (Bar No. 6329630)

Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)

**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**

233 S Wacker Drive, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor, #57

Chicago IL 60606

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

katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com

joseph@bayramoglu-legal.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 1st day of July 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>, and distributed to e-commerce platform, temu.

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter  
Joseph W. Droter (IL Bar No. 6329630)

Defendant Store Name	Email Address
Plus Size Stephanie	52157740@qq.com

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

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY  
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

Plus size Stephanie,

Defendant.

**Case No.: 1:25-cv-02957-JCD-KLHH**

**Honorable Jeremy C. Daniel**

**Magistrate Keri L. Holleb Hotaling**

**PLAINTIFF’S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT AGAINST DEFENDANT**

Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Ltd. (“Plaintiff”) hereby submits this Memorandum of Law in support of its Motion for Entry of Default Judgment (the “Motion”) pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2) (“Rule 55”) against the Defendant, Plus Size Stephanie, (the “Defaulting Defendant” or “Defendant”). Plaintiff’s Motion is made and based upon this Memorandum of Law, the Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn (the “Kuhn Decl.”), the Declaration of Liangjie Li (the “Li Decl.”), the papers and pleadings on file in this action, and any argument of counsel the Court may entertain. Plaintiff’s Motion for entry of Default and Default Judgment disposes of the case.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff’s request for entry of default is straightforward, the Court authorized electronic service of process on the Defendant via email along with issuing a Temporary Restraining Order (the “TRO”) in this matter on April 3, 2025. [Dkt. No. 18] Plaintiff effectuated service on Defendant and filed a Return of Service on April 14, 2025 [Dkt. No. 23]. As set forth in the docket

entry for the Return of Service, a response to Plaintiff’s operative Complaint was due on or before May 5, 2025. No answer was filed, and this Court entered Clerk’s Default on June 3, 2025 [Dkt. No. 28].

Pursuant to Rule 55(b)(2), Plaintiff now also respectfully moves this Court for entry of a default judgment finding the Defaulting Defendant liable on all counts asserted in Plaintiff’s Complaint. [Dkt. No. 1.] These asserted counts include claims for Copyright Infringement (Count I), and violation of the Illinois Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act (the “Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act”) (Count II).

In connection with its asserted claims for relief, Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c) against Defaulting Defendant, which should be enhanced, for their willful infringement of the following federally registered copyright asserted in this action: VA0002379894 (the “Copyright Protected Images”). (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 5.) Plaintiff additionally requests the Court issue a permanent injunction against the Defaulting Defendant. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 502(a). Alternatively, Plaintiff requests issuance of a permanent injunction based on the Defaulting Defendant’s willful violation of the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act.

As alleged in the Complaint, the Defaulting Defendant has displayed, without authorization, the Copyright Protected Images on the Temu.com online sales platform (the “Platform”) to market and sell competing products using Plaintiff’s authentic Rotita brand product photos, thereby deceiving public consumers as to the quality, nature, and source of goods being purchased. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 6.) These circumstances clearly demonstrate the Defaulting Defendant has willfully and intentionally infringed Plaintiff’s Copyright Protected images.

Procedurally, Rule 55(b)(2) provides for a court-ordered default judgment which establishes, as a matter of law, that defendants are liable to plaintiff on each cause of action alleged

in the complaint. *United States v. Di Mucci*, 879 F.2d 1488, 1497 (7th Cir. 1989). When the Court determines that a defendant is in default, the factual allegations of the complaint are taken as true and may not be challenged, and the defendants are liable as a matter of law as to each cause of action alleged in the complaint. *Black v. Lane*, 22 F.3d 1395, 1399 (7th Cir. 1994). Plaintiff meets the requirements for entry of the requested default judgment under Rule 55(b)(2).

## **II. ARGUMENT**

### **A. Jurisdiction And Venue Are Proper in This Court**

This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the claims in this action pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 101, et seq., 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a)–(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331. [Dkt. No. 1] Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, and this Court may properly exercise personal jurisdiction over Defendant since the Defendant directly targets business activities toward consumers in Illinois and causes harm to Plaintiff’s business within this judicial district. [*Id.*]; see also *uBID, Inc. v. GoDaddy Grp., Inc.*, 623 F.3d 421, 423-24 (7th Cir. 2010) (without benefit of an evidentiary hearing, plaintiff bears only the burden of making a prima facie case for personal jurisdiction; all of plaintiff’s asserted facts should be accepted as true and any factual determinations should be resolved in its favor).

In addition to the foregoing, the Court has determined that it can properly exercise specific personal jurisdiction over the Defendant, in issuing the TRO on April 3, 2025 [Dkt. No. 18]. Accordingly, it is unquestionable that the Defaulting Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in this action.

### **B. Plaintiff is Entitled to Entry of the Requested Default Judgment.**

Rule 55(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally provides for entry of a court-ordered default judgment against one or more defending parties that failure to appear, answer,

and/or defend allegations asserted against them. Fed.R.Civ.P. 55(b)(2). A default judgment establishes, as a matter of law, that named, unresponsive, defendants are liable on each cause of action alleged against them in the complaint. *Di Mucci*, 879 F.2d at 1497. When a court determines that a defendant is in default, the factual allegations of the complaint are taken as true and may not be challenged, and the defendants are liable as a matter of law as to each cause of action alleged in the complaint upon entry of default judgment. *Black*, 22 F.3d at 1399.

More than twenty-one (21) days have passed since Defendant was served, and no answer or other responsive pleading has been filed by the Defaulting Defendant. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(A). Thus, default judgment is appropriate, and Plaintiff is entitled to entry of a default judgment pursuant to Rule 55(b)(2) against the Defaulting Defendant for copyright infringement, and violation of the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practice Act as asserted in the Complaint. [Dkt. No. 1 at 31-54.]

As argued below, Plaintiff is entitled to the following remedies through the issuance of a default judgment against the Defaulting Defendant: (1) an award of statutory damages and profits of \$12,000 for copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); (2) an award of enhanced statutory damages of \$36,000 for willful infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2); (3) entry of a permanent injunction pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502(a); and (4) alternatively, entry of a permanent injunction pursuant to 815 ILCS § 510/3.

**C. Plaintiff is Entitled to the Relief Requested.**

Through entry of default, Plaintiff has established that Defaulting Defendant: (1) is liable for intentionally and willfully infringing the Copyright Protected Images; and (2) has willfully violated the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act. As such, the only the following issues remain to be adjudicated through the Motion: (1) Plaintiff's entitlement to an award of statutory damages

for infringement of the Copyright Protected Images; (2) the company's request that any statutory damage award be enhanced based on the Defaulting Defendant's willful copyright infringement; (3) and the company's right to issuance of a permanent injunction against the Defaulting Defendant. Plaintiff asserts that it is entitled to all relief requested through its Motion.

**1. Plaintiff is entitled to statutory damages under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1).**

Turning first to the request for an award of statutory damages under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1) against the Defaulting Defendant. Plaintiff is entitled to such relief for the Defaulting Defendant's infringement of the company's Copyright Protected Images, which it maintains was done willfully and intentionally. (Kuhn Decl. ¶¶ 7, 11-12.)

A copyright owner is entitled to recover the actual damages suffered for infringement, and any profits of the infringer that are attributable to the infringement and are not taken into account in computing the actual damages. 17 U.S.C. § 504(b). In establishing the infringer's profits, the copyright owner is required to present proof only of the infringer's gross revenue, and the infringer is required to prove his or her deductible expenses and the elements of profit attributable to factors other than the copyrighted work. 17 U.S.C. § 504(b). “[S]tatutory damages have been held to be appropriate on a motion for default judgment because the defaulting party has the information needed to prove actual damages.” *White v. Marshall*, 771 F.Supp.2d 952, 956 (E.D. Wis. 2011); *see also Wondie v. Mekuria*, 742 F.Supp.2d 118, 124-25 (D.D.C. 2010); *Lifted Research Grp., Inc. v. Behdad, Inc.*, 591 F.Supp.2d 3, 8 (D.D.C. 2008).

First, Plaintiff has asserted a viable claim for infringement of the Copyright Protected Images. To prove copyright infringement, a plaintiff must show: “(1) ownership of a valid copyright; and (2) copying of constituent elements of the work that are original.” *JWC Invs., Inc. v. Novelty, Inc.*, 482 F.3d 910, 914 (7th Cir. 2007). A certificate of copyright registration provides

a *prima facie* presumption of validity. *Mid. American Title Co. v. Kirk*, 59 F.3d 719, 721 (7th Cir. 1995). Here, Plaintiff has alleged its ownership of the asserted Copyright Protected Image in its Complaint [Dkt. No. 1] and has supplied the Court with a summary of all registrations issued by the United States Copyright Office [Dkt. No. 1, Exhibit. 1]. Moreover, Plaintiff has set forth considerable factual allegations establishing the Defaulting Defendant has infringed the company's Copyright Protected Images. Accordingly, Plaintiff has established that the Defaulting Defendant has infringed the company's Copyright Protected Images.

Next, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of statutory damages given the circumstances in this action. An award of statutory damages is appropriate because actual damages "are often virtually impossible to prove . . . ." *White*, 771 F.Supp.2d at 956. In awarding statutory damages, the court is not required to follow any rigid formula. *Id.* (citing *Chi-Boy Music v. Charlie Club, Inc.*, 930 F.2d 1224, 1229 (7th Cir. 1991)). Instead, the court enjoys wide discretion in setting a statutory damage award within the prescribed range from \$750 to \$30,000 per infringement. *Broadcast Music, Inc. v. Star Amusements, Inc.*, 44 F.3d 485, 489 (7th Cir. 1995). The court may consider such factors as the difficulty or impossibility of proving actual damages, the circumstances of the infringement, and the efficacy of the damages as a deterrent to future copyright infringement. *Chi-Boy Music*, 930 F.2d at 1229.

Plaintiff has established unquestionably viable copyright infringement claims in this case. The Defaulting Defendant's refusal to appear and defend against the asserted claims, however, has deprived Plaintiff of the ability to present evidence concerning verifiable infringing sales or costs associated with such sales. (*Id.* ¶ 7.)

Specifically, Plaintiff has neither obtained, nor is the Defaulting Defendant participating in these proceedings, so that the Court can be provided with the infringers' deductible expenses

related to the sale of the competing products associated with the unauthorized use and display of the company's Copyright Protected Images. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 504(b). As such, there is no verifiable information concerning the Defaulting Defendant's gross infringing sales of their competing products or the associated deductible expenses from same. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7.) Moreover, while Plaintiff can estimate the range of the Defaulting Defendant's net profits from their sales using Plaintiff's copyrighted image, this estimate is highly speculative and cannot affirmatively account for the advertising expenses saved through the unauthorized use and display of the company's Copyright Protected Images for which is has created at considerable expense. (Li Decl. ¶ 10.) Plaintiff has calculated an unverified total infringing sales amount of \$32,669.66, with 3,634 units sold, and attached its analysis as **Exhibit 1** to the Kuhn Declaration filed herewith. (Kuhn Decl., Exhibit 1). Accordingly, an award of statutory damages is appropriate because actual damages are "virtually impossible to prove . . ." in this case. *See White*, 771 F.Supp.2d at 956.

Given the foregoing circumstances, and the nature of the Defaulting Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff asserts that it is entitled to an award of \$12,000 in statutory damages as requested in Exhibit 1 of the Kuhn Declaration in this action. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7, 12, Exhibit. 1.) First, the Defaulting Defendant was provided with notice of these proceedings and, apparently, intentionally elected not to appear and defend. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7). As a result of the Defaulting Defendant's intentional decision not to appear and defend this action, Plaintiff has been deprived of a meaningful opportunity to assess the true nature of its actual damages. (*Id.*)

Moreover, Plaintiff has expended considerable capital in securing registration of the Copyright Protected Images and advertising its brand in the United States and in the State of Illinois. (Li. Decl. ¶ 9.) This includes spending over \$80,000 to secure the company's copyright registrations with the United States Copyright Office and spending approximately \$8,000,000 to

\$12,000,000 annually to advertise and promote its Rotita brand in the United States. (*Id.*) These facts unquestionably support Plaintiff's request for an award in statutory damages against the Defaulted Defendant.

Next, the circumstances of the Defaulting Defendant's infringement clearly support awarding the requested statutory damage award against them. It is without question that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyright Protected Images. In this regard, Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Images, often representing product line releases, have appeared on the Defaulting Defendant's online store maintained with the Platform. (Li Decl. ¶ 7.) Accordingly, the Defaulting Defendant unquestionably intentionally, and willfully, infringed Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Images to sell their competing products using the Copyrighted image, thereby justifying an award of statutory damages.

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court award statutory damages against the Defaulting Defendant for each infringing Temu infringing goods id, which shows infringement of the Copyright Protected Image. As set forth in Plaintiff's supporting documentation, the Defaulting Defendant in this action should be found liable for \$12,000 in statutory damages, which should be treble enhanced because of their infringements of the Copyright Protected Image. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 12, Ex. 1.) Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court an award of \$12,000 in statutory damages for copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1) against Defaulting Defendant. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 12)

**2. Plaintiff is entitled to enhanced statutory damages.**

Next, the circumstances of the Defaulting Defendant's infringement clearly support awarding an enhanced statutory damage award of, at least, treble damages against them. Simply

put, the Defaulting Defendant's infringing conduct in this action is unquestionably willful, thereby justifying enhanced damages under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).

It is without question that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyright Protected Image. (Kuhn Decl. ¶¶ 8, 11-12.) In this regard, Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Image, often representing recent product releases, have appeared on the Defaulting Defendant's online store maintained with the Platform. (Li Decl. ¶ 7.)

In addition, defendants in multiple copyright enforcement actions in this judicial district, which includes the Defaulting Defendant, has been acting through their network to actively monitor and post information on the Plaintiff's pending cases on the website [www.SellerDefense.cn](http://www.SellerDefense.cn). (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 8.) This has apparently been done to advise defendants in all pending actions of Plaintiff's successful prosecution of its claims, and the viability of appearing and asserting potential defenses. (*Id.*) These circumstances reveal an overall strategy by all non-appearing defendants, including the Defaulting Defendant, to simply cut their losses where Plaintiff has a high likelihood of success, abandon any online platform storefront, and bask in the security that any judgment issued against them will almost certainly not be collectable in the Republic of China. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 8.) Such circumstances support awarding Plaintiff enhanced statutory damages in this action. *See Chi-Boy Music*, 930 F.2d at 1229.

The facts presented further support awarding the enhanced statutory damages against the Defaulting Defendant on the grounds that they should serve as a deterrent to future conduct. *Id.* at 1229-30. Simply put, the Defaulting Defendant is watching the results of Plaintiff's copyright infringement enforcement actions in this judicial district. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 8.) The Defaulting Defendant, as with other similarly situated defendants, has simply taken the apparent position that

any recovery issued by a court is only executable against their assets on the named online platform, which are not restrained in this case. (*Id.*) This conduct demonstrates an intentional wiliness to ignore the Court's authority to impose significant statutory damages in this action to send a message to the Defaulting Defendant, and all other similar infringers, that they will incur substantial liability for their actions. In doing so, hopefully the Defaulting Defendant, or other similar infringers monitoring this case, will post this anticipated reward on the [www.SellersDefense.cn](http://www.SellersDefense.cn) website as notice of the consequences for their intentional, and orchestrated actions.

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court award enhanced statutory damages of not less than treble the requested statutory damages, \$36,000. As set forth in Plaintiff's supporting documentation Exhibit 1 to the Kuhn Declaration, the Defaulting Defendant in this action should be found liable because of their willful infringement of the Copyright Protected Image. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 12, Ex. 1) Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court enter an award of \$12,000.00 against Defendant, Plus Size Stephanie, in statutory damages, which should be enhanced for willful infringement to \$36,000.00 against Defendant, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).

### **3. Plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction.**

Next, Plaintiff is entitled to entry of a permanent injunction against the Defaulting Defendant. This request is justified under either 17 U.S.C. § 502(a) or, alternatively, under the Uniform Deceptive Practices Act pursuant to 815 ILCS § 510/3.

This provision allows courts to issue such relief on terms deemed reasonable to protect the rights of copyright holders. In cases where defendants fail to respond or appear, courts have consistently granted permanent injunctions as part of default judgments, particularly when there is

evidence of ongoing or likely future infringement. For example, in *Virgin Records Am. Inc. v. Johnson*, the court granted a permanent injunction under § 502(a) due to the defendant's failure to respond and the likelihood of continued infringement, emphasizing the public interest in upholding copyright protections. *Virgin Records Am. Inc. v. Johnson*, 441 F. Supp. 2d 963. Here, Defendant has elected to not appear or respond to the lawsuit and therefore show a likelihood they will continue infringement absent a permanent injunction.

Courts in the 7th Circuit have also applied the four-factor test for injunctive relief, requiring plaintiffs to show irreparable harm, inadequacy of legal remedies, a balance of hardships favoring the plaintiff, and that the injunction serves the public interest. In *White v. Marshall*, the court noted that copyright infringement often constitutes irreparable harm and that monetary damages are inadequate, justifying injunctive relief. *White v. Marshall*, 771 F. Supp. 2d 952. Additionally, courts have recognized a presumption of irreparable harm in copyright cases, further supporting the issuance of permanent injunctions. *See also In re Aimster Copyright Litig.*, 252 F. Supp. 2d 634. Here, Plaintiff has a valid copyright claim against Defendant, which should have a presumption of irreparable harm in this case. Additionally, permanently enjoining the copyright infringement will ensure that public interest is met, by preventing any future, continued infringement of the Copyrighted Image.

As such, Plaintiff's right to permanent injunctive relief under 17 U.S.C. § 502(a) or, alternatively, under the Uniform Deceptive Practices Act pursuant to 815 ILCS § 510/3, is uncontested and supported by the substantial evidentiary record previously provided to the Court. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to issuance of permanent injunctive relief against the Defaulting Defendant.

**III. CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully request entry of default judgment against the Defaulting Defendant, Plus size Stephanie pursuant to Rule 55. In granting its request, Plaintiff asks the Court to award the following: (1) statutory damages of \$12,000.00 against Defaulting Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); (2) enhanced statutory damages of \$36,000.00 against Defaulting Defendant based on its willful infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2); (3) issuance of a permanent injunction against the Defaulting Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502(a) or, alternatively, under the Uniform Deceptive Practices Act pursuant to 815 ILCS § 510/3; (4) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: July 1, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Joseph W Droter

Joseph W. Droter (Bar No. 6329630)

Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)

**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**

233 S Wacker Drive, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor, #57

Chicago IL 60606

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

katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com

joseph@bayramoglu-legal.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 1st day of July 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>, and distributed to e-commerce platform, temu.

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter  
Joseph W. Droter (IL Bar No. 6329630)

Defendant Store Name	Email Address
Plus Size Stephanie	52157740@qq.com

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

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY  
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

Plus size Stephanie,

Defendant.

**Case No.: 1:25-cv-02957-JCD-KLHH**

**Honorable Jeremy C. Daniel**

**Magistrate Keri L. Holleb Hotaling**

**DECLARATION OF KATHERINE M. KUHN IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT**

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 Default Judgment against the Defendant, Plus Size Stephanie (the "Defaulting Defendant" or "Defendant").

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 one of the attorneys for Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Ltd. ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration from my matters within my own knowledge unless stated otherwise.

4. I hereby certify that the Defaulting Defendant (as defined in the accompanying Memorandum) have failed to plead or otherwise defend this action within twenty-one (21) days after being served with the Summons and Complaint in this action in violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)(1)(A). Specifically, Defendant was served with copies of the Summons and

Complaint via electronic service authorized by the Court on April 14, 2025, which is reflected in the Return of Summons filed in this case. [Dkt. No. 23]. Defaulting Defendant has not answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff's Complaint in this action, which resulted in this Court granting Plaintiff's motion for Entry of Clerk's Default on June 3, 2025 [Dkt. No. 28].

5. Plaintiff's asserted claims for relief in this action involve the intentional, willful infringement of the following federally registered copyright: VA0002379894 (the "Copyright Protected Images").

6. As alleged in the Complaint, the Defaulting Defendant has displayed, without authorization, the Copyright Protected Images on the Temu.com online sales platform (the "Platform") to market and sell competing products using Plaintiff's authentic Rotita brand Copyrighted photos through their online store (the "Online Store"), thereby deceiving public consumers as to the quality, nature, and source of goods being purchased.

7. Plaintiff is entitled to statutory damages in this action as described in **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration, which shows the Infringing Temu Goods ID, Number of Infringing Units Sold per Temu, Estimated Infringement Revenue, and Statutory Damages Request based on the estimated sales. First, the Defaulting Defendant was provided with notice of these proceedings and, apparently, intentionally elected not to appear and defend this action. As a result of the Defaulting Defendant's intentional decision not to appear and defend this action, Plaintiff has been deprived of a meaningful opportunity to assess the true nature of its actual damages. This uncertainty supports Plaintiff's requested statutory damages against the Defaulting Defendant.

8. In addition, defendants in multiple copyright enforcement actions in this judicial district, which includes the Defaulting Defendants, have been acting through their network to actively monitor and post information on the Plaintiff's pending cases on the website

www.SellerDefense.cn. This has apparently been done to advise defendants in all pending actions of Plaintiff's successful prosecution of its claims, and the viability of appearing and asserting potential defenses. These circumstances reveal an overall strategy by all non-appearing defendants, including the Defaulting Defendant, to simply cut their losses where Plaintiff has a high likelihood of success, abandon any online platform storefront, and bask in the security that any judgment issued against them will almost certainly not be collectable in the Republic of China. Additionally, any default judgment would only be executable against their assets on the named online platform, which are not restrained in this case. Simply put, the Defaulting Defendants are watching the results of Plaintiff's copyright infringement enforcement actions in this judicial district.

9. To maximize the deterrent effect of the Court's anticipated default judgment, Plaintiff is asking that enhanced statutory damages be imposed on the Defaulting Defendant for the alleged infringement of the Copyright Protected Images.

10. Such an award precludes the Defaulting Defendants from shielding themselves from monetary responsibility for the collective infringement of common Copyright Protected Images. *Desire, LLC v. Manna Textiles, Inc.*, 986 F.3d 1253, 1264-1272 (9th Cir. 2021). Rather, Plaintiff expressly requests that the Defaulting Defendant, be assessed an enhanced statutory damage award as described in **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration for their infringement of the Copyright Protected Images.

11. Plaintiff has alleged, and has offered proof, that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the infringement of the Copyright Protected Images. [Dkt. No. 14-7]

12. The presented facts not only establish the Defaulting Defendants' knowledge and intentional infringement of Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Images. Accordingly, Plaintiff should be awarded statutory damages, as described in **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration, with treble the

enhancement against Defaulted Defendant based on its willful infringement of the Copyright Protected Images. Attached is **Exhibit 1** showing the infringing sales data provided by Temu, price per unit, and total unverified revenue calculated by Plaintiff.

13. My office, with assistance from our client and those assisting our client, investigated the infringing activities of the Defaulting Defendant, including attempting to identify their contact information. Our investigation confirmed that the Defaulting Defendant is primarily domiciled in Asia. As such, I am informed and believe that the Defaulting Defendant is not an active-duty member of the U.S. armed forces.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: July 1, 2025

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

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 1st day of July 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>, and distributed to e-commerce platform, temu.

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter  
Joseph W. Droter (IL Bar No. 6329630)

Defendant Store Name	Email Address
Plus Size Stephanie	52157740@qq.com

# Exhibit 1

Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Limited v. Plus Size Stephanie  
1:25-cv-2957

**Defendant: Plus Size Stephanie**

**Temu mall id: 5324797366747**

**Email: 52157740@qq.com**

**Copyright Infringed: VA0002379894**

<b>Temu goods id (Plus Size Stephanie) Link using Plaintiff's Copyright</b>	<b>the number of units sold using Plaintiff's Copyright (data from Temu)</b>	<b>Price Per Unit</b>	<b>Estimated Infringing Revenue</b>	<b>Statutory Request Amount</b>	<b>Treble Enhanced for Willful Infringement Request</b>
601099523002080	3,634	\$8.99	\$32,669.66	\$12,000	\$36,000.00
				<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$36,000.00</b>

Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Limited v. Plus Size Stephanie  
1:25-cv-2957

RE:Re: RE:NDIL Case No. 25-cv-02957; SUBPOENA TO TEMU (1 Defendant Store) Plus size Stephanie



DATA-25....xlsx



legal@temu.com



To: Joseph Droter

Thu 4/10/2025 4:48 AM

Cc: Litigation; BLO copyright

DATA-25-cv-02957.xlsx  
14 KB

Dear Counsel,

Please find attached the data requested in reference to the case No.25-cv-02957. Below is the password for the attachment. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Password: IKed#T5LK5@+(

Regards,

Temu Legal Team

The original message



A	B	C
mall_id	goods_id	the number of units sold(us 2025-04-08)
5324797366747	601099523002080	3634

A	B	C	D
mall id	mall name	email address	
5324797366747	Plus size Stephanie	52157740@qq.com	

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

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY  
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

Plus size Stephanie,

Defendant.

**Case No.: 1:25-cv-02957-JCD-KLHH**

**Honorable Jeremy C. Daniel**

**Magistrate Keri L. Holleb Hotaling**

**DECLARATION OF LIANGJIE LI  
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT**

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 Default and Default Judgment (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 copyright infringement through online platforms such as

Amazon, Walmart, Alibaba, eBay, Aliexpress, and Temu (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 seeks an award of statutory damages against the defaulted Defendants per copyright infringing product link (the “Defaulting Defendant”) in this action. The Defaulting Defendant is accused of intentionally and willfully infringing Plaintiff’s following federally registered copyright asserted in this action: VA0002379894 (the “Copyright Protected Images”).

7. It is without question that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyright Protected Images. In this regard, Plaintiff’s Copyright Protected Images, often representing recent product releases, have appeared on the Defaulting Defendant’s online store maintained with the Platform (the “Online Stores”).

8. Defaulting Defendant has intentionally used the Copyright Protected Images for soliciting competing, product sales on a Platform that Plaintiff does not, and has not, utilized to sell its authentic products. Simply put, these facts not only establish the Defaulting Defendant’s knowledge and intentional infringement of Plaintiff’s Copyright Protected Images.

9. 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. Plaintiff annually spends tens of millions of dollars advertising in the United States to promote the sale of its brand.

10. 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 the Defaulting 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 Temu.com search engine optimization. Doing so causes their online stores to be displayed whenever someone searches for "Rotita" on Temu.com despite Plaintiff not selling authentic "Rotita" brand products on the platform. Based on the foregoing, I would estimate that the Defaulting Defendant's Online Stores operate at a net profit of between 40% to 50%. I believe that a disgorgement of the Defaulting Defendants' profits would fall within the net profit range. However, it is impossible to definitively calculate the Defaulting Defendants' total sales on the Platform through their Online Stores or to ascertain their expenses related to their infringing sales because they have failed to appear, defend, or otherwise participate in this action.

11. The Defaulting Defendant, Plus size Stephanie is engaged in the practice of copying Plaintiff's copyright protected product images after they are displayed on the company's website and then associating these images with sale and promotion of unauthorized, competing products of substandard quality, thereby deceiving consumers – including the citizens of the State of Illinois. Plaintiff maintains that the Defaulting Defendant is acting, 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 a common source associated with manufacturing the competing products being sold on the Defaulting Defendant's Platform storefront.

12. Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, irreparable harm through the Defaulting Defendant's 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.

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

Executed on July 1, 2025, in Hong Kong.

By: /s/ Liangjie Li  
LIANGJIE LI

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 1st day of July 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>, and distributed to e-commerce platform, temu.

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter  
Joseph W. Droter (IL Bar No. 6329630)

Defendant Store Name	Email Address
Plus Size Stephanie	52157740@qq.com