

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
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. 1:25-cv-05945-TMD-LKM

Honorable Thomas M. Durkin

Magistrate Laura K. McNally

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT
AGAINST THE IDENTIFIED SCHEDULE "A" DEFENDANTS**

Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Limited ("Plaintiff") hereby moves for entry of Default and Default Judgment against the following Defendants, as identified by Defendant number and name in Schedule A attached below and separately listed in Exhibit 1 to the accompanying Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn (the "Kuhn Decl."). Plaintiff files herewith a Memorandum of Law in support, The Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn, and the Declaration of Liangjie Li. Plaintiff's Motion for entry of Default and Default Judgment disposes of all remaining defendants.

DATED: September 19, 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, 44th Floor, #57

Chicago IL 60606

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

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 19th day of September 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, TikTok.

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

No.	Name	Contact Information
1	enjoymall	460266252@qq.com
2	Ginoa	tanjngnan@hibosssshop.com
3	Anja Anja	619409314@qq.com
4	DONWORD	1007929243@qq.com
5	Kaibom	cxq8412@163.com
6	Mewwos9866	xiangwewqzt9177@163.com
7	Pengze Clothes	1826065541@qq.com
8	Nutricia Shop	zbw112611@gmail.com
9	GivensonStore12	cineasgivenson@gmail.com
10	BRISTL'S STORE	460266252@qq.com
11	ERHGERGEW	biaoerday8993@163.com
12	HERHGESGVAV	ranwenyongres9@163.com
13	Xinzhiyu Clothing	137894329@qq.com
14	ROBO7222	quanzbf0@163.com
15	BAHSDGSDB	tanr5859470@163.com
16	Colour Dress	1637102811@qq.com
17	SEXYAPPAREL23	sexyapparel23@gmail.com

Schedule A: 25-cv-05945

Defendant No.	Seller's Name	Link to Seller's Website
VA0002380492		
1	enjoymall	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729458389191267204
VA0002384827		
2	Ginoa	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729418967828107442
VA0002413196		
3	Anja Anja	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729436357691412731
VA0002381842		
4	DONWORD	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729715270230774169
5	Kaibom	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729491481893966763
6	Mewwos9866	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729672886505738791
VA0002384838		
7	Pengze Clothes	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729488403167285842
8	Nutricia Shop	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729563670526202053
VA0002413196		
9	GivensonStore12	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729596120129507420
10	BRISTL'S STORE	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729478955038969856
11	ERHGERGEW	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729576929802490867
12	HERHGESGVAW	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729576978412900766
VA0002413202		
13	Xinzhiyu Clothing	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729550785132793875
14	ROBO7222	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729712584401916091
15	BAHSDGSDB	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729660764741210938
16	Colour Dress	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729386850403653154
VA0002379934		
17	SEXYAPPAREL23	https://www.tiktok.com/view/product/1729474583205613825

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
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. 1:25-cv-05945-TMD-LKM

Honorable Thomas M. Durkin

Magistrate Laura K. McNally

**PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT
AGAINST THE IDENTIFIED SCHEDULE "A" DEFENDANTS**

Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Ltd. ("Plaintiff") hereby submits this Memorandum of Law in support of its Motion for Entry of Default and Default Judgment (the "Motion") pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55 ("Rule 55") against the identified Schedule "A" Defendants (collectively, the "Defaulting Defendants"), which have been separately listed in Exhibit "1" to the accompanying Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn (the "Kuhn Decl."). Plaintiff's Motion is made and based upon this Memorandum of Law, the Kuhn Declaration, 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 all remaining defendants.

I. INTRODUCTION

On June 18, 2025, the Court authorized electronic service via email on the Schedule "A" Defendants [Dkt. No. 21]. Plaintiff completed service on all named Defendants and filed a Return of Service on August 28, 2025 [Dkt. No. 26]. The deadline to respond to the Complaint was September 18, 2025.

Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c) against the Defaulting Defendants for each infringement of the Copyright Protected Images, which encompass Plaintiff's dress collection, and which should be enhanced for their willful infringement of the federally registered copyrights asserted in this action; (1) VA0002380492, (2) VA0002384827, (3) VA0002413196, (4) VA0002381842, (5) VA0002384838 (6) VA0002413196, (7) VA0002413202 and (8) VA0002379934. (the "Copyright Protected Images"). (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 5.) Plaintiff additionally requests the Court issue a permanent injunction against the Defaulting Defendants. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 502(a). Alternatively, Plaintiff requests issuance of a permanent injunction based on the Defaulting Defendants' willful violation of the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)(1)(A), the Defaulting Defendants had twenty-one (21) days to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint in this action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(A)", Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(a), "when a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise, the clerk must enter the party's default." Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a).

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).

III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As alleged in the Complaint, here the Defaulting Defendants have publicly displayed unlicensed and unauthorized reproductions of Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Images on TikTok's online sales platform (the "Platform") to benefit from Plaintiff's Rotita copyrighted images by using them to market and sell competing products, thereby deceiving public consumers as to the origin, association, quality, nature, and source of goods being purchased. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 6.) Moreover, the Defaulting Defendants are alleged to be operating as part of a coordinated, sophisticated network that utilizes a common supply chains and manufacturing sources to fulfill consumer orders. Defendants are able to offer products at a reduced prices and produce large quantities of products, which is unachievable on an individual basis. As of the filing of this Motion, approximately twenty-two days (22) have expired since electronic service was effectuated on the Schedule "A" Defendants, which includes the Defaulting Defendants that are the subject of Plaintiff's Motion. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 4.) To date, none of the Defaulting Defendants have answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff's Complaint. (*Id.*) Therefore, the Clerk of the Court is compelled to enter default pursuant to Rule 55(a) against the Defaulting Defendants.

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). Here, Defaulting Defendants have willfully and intentionally infringed Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Images, supporting the Plaintiff's request for enhanced statutory damages. Plaintiff meets the requirements for entry of the requested default judgment under Rule 55(b)(2).

IV. 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 at 2-3.] Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, and this Court may properly exercise personal jurisdiction over Defendants since each of the Defendants directly targets business activities toward consumers in Illinois and causes harm to Plaintiff's business within this judicial district. [Dkt. No. 1 at 2-3]; *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 the case at bar, it is unquestionable that the Defaulting Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in this action.

B. Plaintiff Has Met the Requirements for Entry of Default Under Rule 55(a)

Pursuant to Rule 55(a), "when a party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is sought has failed to plead or otherwise defend, and that failure is shown by affidavit or otherwise, the clerk must enter the party's default." Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a). Plaintiff meets these requirements. Here, Plaintiff filed its Complaint alleging, among other claims, Copyright Infringement (Count I), and violation of the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act (Count II) as asserted in the company's Complaint. [Dkt. No. 1 at 43-66.]. All Defendants, which includes the Defaulting

Defendants, were properly served with the Complaint, Summons, and all supporting documents via electronic service on August 28, 2025. [Dkt. No. 26] The Defaulting Defendants had twenty-one (21) days to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint pursuant to Rule 12(a)(1)(A). Here, the Defaulting Defendants were required to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint on or before September 18, 2025. [*Id.*] As of the filing of this Motion, approximately twenty-two (22) days have expired since electronic service was effectuated on the Schedule "A" Defendants, which includes the Defaulting Defendants that are the subject of Plaintiff's Motion. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 4.) To date, none of the Defaulting Defendants have answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff's Complaint. (*Id.*) Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is compelled to enter default and default judgment pursuant to Rule 55 against the Defaulting Defendants.

C. Plaintiff is Entitled to Entry of the Requested Default Judgment

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. Here, more than twenty-one (21) days have passed since Defendants were served, and no answer or other responsive pleading has been filed by any of the Defaulting Defendants identified in Schedule "A." *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(a)(1)(A). Therefore, an entry of a default judgment is appropriate.

Moreover, Plaintiff is entitled to the following remedies through the issuance of a default judgment against the Defaulting Defendants as listed out in Exhibit 1 to the Kuhn Declaration: (1) an award of statutory damages per Defaulting Defendant for copyright infringement under 17

U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); (2) an award of enhanced statutory damages per Defaulting Defendant 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.

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

Plaintiff is entitled to such relief for the Defaulting Defendants' infringement of the Copyright Protected Images, which it maintains was done willfully and intentionally. (Kuhn Decl. ¶¶ 8, 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). In this case at bar, Plaintiff has asserted a viable claim for infringement of its 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 Images 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, Ex. 1]. Moreover, Plaintiff has set forth considerable factual allegations establishing the Defaulting Defendants have infringed the Copyright Protected Images. [Dkt. Nos. 1-3, 2-3.] Therefore, the Defaulting Defendants have infringed the 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. Here, Plaintiff has established unquestionably viable copyright infringement claims in this case. Additionally, the Defaulting Defendants' willful refusal to appear and defend against the asserted claims has deprived Plaintiff of the ability to present evidence concerning verifiable infringing sales or costs associated with such sales. (*Id.* ¶ 7.)

Specifically, TikTok has provided sales data regarding the Defaulting Defendants, however since they are not participating in these proceedings, the Court cannot be provided with the infringers' deductible expenses related to the sale of the competing products associated with the unauthorized use and public display of Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Images. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 504(b). As such, there is no verifiable information concerning the Defaulting Defendants' gross infringing sales of their competing products using Plaintiff's copyrights or the associated

deductible expenses from same. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7.) Moreover, while Plaintiff can estimate the range of the Defaulting Defendants' net profits from their infringing sales provided by the Platform, 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 it has created at considerable expense. (Li Decl. ¶ 11.) Therefore, 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 Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff asserts that it is entitled to an award of statutory damages against each Defaulting Defendant and submits a Defendant-by-Defendant analysis showing each Defaulting Defendant, the copyright infringed, and the statutory damages requested. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 12, Exhibit. 1.)

In this case the Defaulting Defendants were provided with notice of these proceedings and, apparently, intentionally elected not to appear and defend. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7). As a result of the Defaulting Defendants' 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.*) 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. ¶ 10.) 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. (Li Decl. ¶ 10.) These facts unquestionably support Plaintiff's request statutory damages per infringed Copyright Protected Image per Defaulted Defendant.

The actions of the Defaulting Defendants' infringement clearly support awarding the requested statutory damage award against them. It is without question that the Defaulting Defendants have engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyright Protected Images. In this regard, Plaintiff's Copyright-Protected Images, often representing product releases, have then appeared on the Defaulting Defendants' online stores maintained with the Platform. (Li Decl. ¶ 7.) Moreover, the Defaulting Defendants have unquestionably been operating their online stores using the misappropriated Copyright Protected Images through a sophisticated network utilizing a highly developed supply chain capable of supplying thousands of competing products featuring an array of similarities to Plaintiff's textile patterns and designs that could not otherwise be accomplished on an individual basis. (Kuhn Decl. ¶¶ 8, 11.) These actions by the Defendant, justify an award of statutory damages. Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court award statutory damages for copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1) per Defaulting Defendant per infringed Copyright Protected Image. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 12, Ex. 1)

2. Plaintiff is entitled to enhanced statutory damages.

Here, the Defaulting Defendants' infringement clearly supports awarding an enhanced statutory damage award of, at least, treble damages against them. The Defaulting Defendants' infringing conduct in this action are willful, thereby justifying enhanced damages under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2). Defaulting Defendants have engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyright Protected Images. (Kuhn Decl. ¶¶ 8, 11-12.) Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Images, often representing recent product releases, have appeared on each the Defaulting Defendants' online stores maintained with the Platform. (Li Decl. ¶ 7.) The Defaulting Defendants have clearly been operating their online stores using the unauthorized and unlicensed

Copyright Protected Images. Upon information and belief, 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. (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 common scheme the Defaulting Defendants, to simply cut their losses where Plaintiff has a high likelihood of success, abandon any online 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 Defendants on the grounds that they should serve as a deterrent to future conduct. *Id.* at 1229-30. Here, the Defaulting Defendants are watching the results of Plaintiff's copyright infringement enforcement actions in this judicial district. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 8.) To maximize the deterrent effect of the Court's anticipated default and default judgment, Plaintiff is asking that enhanced statutory damages be imposed on the Defaulting Defendant for each alleged infringement of the Copyright Protected Images. (*Id.* ¶ 9.) The Defaulting Defendants have simply taken the apparent position that any recovery issued by a court is not executable against their assets on the named online platform in the U.S. This conduct demonstrates an intentional willingness to ignore the Court's authority to impose significant statutory damages in this action to send a message to the Defaulting Defendants, and all other similar infringers, that they will incur substantial liability for their actions. In doing so, hopefully the Defaulting Defendants, or other similar infringers monitoring this case, will post this

anticipated award on the www.SellerDefense.cn website as notice of the consequences for their intentional, and orchestrated actions.

Here, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court enter an award of statutory damages per Defaulted Defendant per infringed Copyright Protected Image, which should be treble enhanced for willful infringement per Defaulted Defendant per infringed Copyright Protected Work, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2). A Defendant-by-Defendant request analysis is provided as Exhibit 1 to the Kuhn Declaration. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 12, Exhibit. 1).

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. 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, Defaulting Defendants have elected to not appear or respond to the lawsuit and therefore shows 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 Defaulting Defendants, which has 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 Images.

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 Defendants.

V. CONCLUSION

Under Rule 55(b)(2), Plaintiff respectfully requests this Court for entry of a default judgment finding the Defaulting Defendants 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). [Dkt. No. 1 at 43-66.] In granting its request, Plaintiff asks the Court to award the following: (1) statutory damages per Defaulting Defendant per infringed Copyright Protected Image pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); (2) enhanced treble statutory damages per Defaulting Defendant per infringed Copyright Protected Image based on their willful infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2); (3) issuance of a permanent injunction against the Defaulting

Defendants pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502(a) or, alternatively, under the Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act pursuant to 815 ILCS § 510/3; and (4) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: September 19, 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, 44th Floor, #57

Chicago IL 60606

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

Joseph@bayramoglu-legal.com

Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 19th day of September 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, TikTok.

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

No.	Name	Contact Information
1	enjoymall	460266252@qq.com
2	Ginoa	tanjingnan@hibosshop.com
3	Anja Anja	619409314@qq.com
4	DONWORD	1007929243@qq.com
5	Kaibom	cxq8412@163.com
6	Mewwos9866	xiangwqwzt9177@163.com
7	Pengze Clothes	1826065541@qq.com
8	Nutricia Shop	zbx112611@gmail.com
9	GivensonStore12	cineasgivenson@gmail.com
10	BRISTL'S STORE	460266252@qq.com
11	ERHGERGEW	biaoerday8993@163.com
12	HERHGESGVAW	ranwenyongres9@163.com
13	Xinzhiyu Clothing	137894329@qq.com
14	ROBO7222	quanzbf0@163.com
15	BAHSDGSDB	tanr5859470@163.com
16	Colour Dress	1637102811@qq.com
17	SEXYAPPAREL23	sexyapparel23@gmail.com

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
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. 1:25-cv-05945-TMD-LKM

Honorable Thomas M. Durkin

Magistrate Laura K. McNally

**DECLARATION OF KATHERINE M. KUHN IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT AND 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 and Default Judgment (the "Motion") against the identified Schedule "A" Defendants (collectively, the "Defaulting Defendants"), which have been separately listed in Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn.

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. Limited ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration from my matters within my own knowledge unless stated otherwise.

4. I hereby certify that the Defaulting Defendants (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, all Schedule “A” Defendants were served with copies of the Summons and Complaint via electronic service authorized by the Court on August 28, 2025, which is reflected in the Return of Summons filed in this case. [Dkt. No. 26.] As of the filing of this Motion, approximately twenty-two (22) days have expired since electronic service was effectuated on the Schedule “A” Defendants, which includes the Defaulting Defendants that are the subject of Plaintiff’s Motion. None of the identified Defaulting Defendants have answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff’s Complaint in this action.

5. Plaintiff’s asserted claims for relief in this action involve the intentional, willful infringement of the federally registered copyrights: (1) VA0002380492, (2) VA0002384827, (3) VA0002413196, (4) VA0002381842, (5) VA0002384838 (6) VA0002413196, (7) VA0002413202 and (8) VA0002379934. (the “Copyright Protected Images”).

6. As alleged in the Complaint, the Defaulting Defendants have displayed, without authorization, the Copyright Protected Images on the TikTok.com online sales platform (the “Platform”) to market and sell competing products resembling Plaintiff’s authentic Rotita brand products through their online stores (the “Online Stores”), 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 Defendant-by-Defendant Statutory Damages Request based on the copyright infringement. First, the Defaulting Defendants were provided with notice of these proceedings and, apparently, intentionally elected not to appear and defend this action.

Additionally, the platform TikTok has provided sales data for Defendants. However, as a result of the Defaulting Defendants' intentional decision not to appear and defend this action, Plaintiff is unable to receive the complete sales information from Defendants. Accordingly, 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 Defendants.

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 Defendants, to simply cut their losses where Plaintiff has a high likelihood of success, abandon their online store, and bask in the security that any judgment issued against them will almost certainly not be collectable in the Republic of China. 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 and default judgment, Plaintiff is asking that enhanced statutory damages be imposed on the Defaulting Defendants for each 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 Defendants, 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 Defendants have not only engaged in the infringement of the Copyright Protected Images, but they have done so through a highly sophisticated network. Moreover, the basic nature of the copyright infringement scheme employed demonstrates that the Defaulting Defendants not only knew of the impropriety of their conduct but had to implement their scheme through sophisticated sources and established supply chains. This is the only possible scenario under which the Defaulting Defendants could immediately procure, without authorization, Plaintiff's copyright protected product images and offer them for sale through their online stores.

12. The presented facts not only establish the Defaulting Defendant's 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, which lists all Defaulted Defendants, the infringed Copyright Protected Image, the statutory damage amount requested per infringement, and the amount requested based on the Defaulted Defendant's willful infringement with treble the enhancement against Defaulted Defendants based on their willful infringement of the Copyright Protected Images.

13. My office, with assistance from our client and those assisting our client, investigated the infringing activities of the Defaulting Defendants, including attempting to identify their contact information. Our investigation confirmed that the Defaulting Defendants are

primarily domiciled in Asia. As such, I am informed and believe that the Defaulting Defendants are not active-duty members of the U.S. armed forces.

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

DATED: September 19, 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 19th day of September 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, TikTok.

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

No.	Name	Contact Information
1	enjoymall	460266252@qq.com
2	Ginoa	tanjingnan@hibosshop.com
3	Anja Anja	619409314@qq.com
4	DONWORD	1007929243@qq.com
5	Kaibom	cxq8412@163.com
6	Mewwos9866	xiangwewqzt9177@163.com
7	Pengze Clothes	1826065541@qq.com
8	Nutricia Shop	zbw112611@gmail.com
9	GivensonStore12	cineasgivenson@gmail.com
10	BRISTL'S STORE	460266252@qq.com
11	ERHGERGEW	biaoerday8993@163.com
12	HERHGESGVAW	ranwenyongres9@163.com
13	Xinzhiyu Clothing	137894329@qq.com
14	ROBO7222	quanzbf0@163.com
15	BAHSDGSDB	tanr5859470@163.com
16	Colour Dress	1637102811@qq.com
17	SEXYAPPAREL23	sexyapparel23@gmail.com

Exhibit 1

Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Limited v. The Individuals, Corporations, Limited
Liability Companies, Partnerships and Unincorporated Associations Identified in Schedule A

17 Defaulted Defendants 1:25-cv-05945

No	TikTok Store Name/Defendant	TikTok Store ID Contact email	Infringement(s)	Infringement Sales (\$) Provided by TikTok	Statutory Amount Requested	Enhanced x3 for Willful Infringement Total Requested
1	enjoymall	8646959264639190916 460266252@qq.com	VA0002380492	\$967.71	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
2	Ginoa	8646979664252342450 tanjingnan@hibosshop.com	VA0002384827	\$359.28	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
3	Anja Anja	8647015554202964219 619409314@qq.com	VA0002413196	\$610.6	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
4	DONWORD	8647126998303478169 1007929243@qq.com	VA0002381842	\$538.36	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
5	Kaibom	8647015672785310635 cxq8412@163.com	VA0002381842	\$2,882.19	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
6	Mewwos9866	7495877050899860007 xiangwewqzt9177@163.com	VA0002381842	-	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
7	Pengze Clothes	8647172532064457298 1826065541@qq.com	VA0002384838	\$2,156.98	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
8	Nutricia Shop	8647164545179553989 zbu112611@gmail.com	VA0002384838	\$1,435.67	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
9	GivensonStore12	7495704267868702812 cineasgivenson@gmail.com	VA0002413196	\$149.25	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
10	BRISTL'S STORE	7495729920250054656 460266252@qq.com	VA0002413196	-	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
11	ERHGERGEW	7495830642020748275 biaoerday8993@163.com	VA0002413196	\$473.21	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
12	HERHGESGVAW	7495831877546641822 ranwenyongres9@163.com	VA0002413196	-	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
13	Xinzhiyu Clothing	8647175233928925203 137894329@qq.com	VA0002413202	\$15.76	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
14	ROBO7222	7495923245918554299 quanzbf0@163.com	VA0002413202	-	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
15	BAHSDGSDB	7495796750728399674 tanr5859470@163.com	VA0002413202	-	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
16	Colour Dress	8646925979896287778 1637102811@qq.com	VA0002413202	\$33.38	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
17	SEXYAPPAREL23	7495256796553054465 sexyapparel23@gmail.com	VA0002379934	-	\$5,000.00	Total: \$15,000
TOTAL: \$85,000.00						TOTAL: \$255,000.00

**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. 1:25-cv-05945-TMD-LKM

Honorable Thomas M. Durkin

Magistrate Laura K. McNally

**DECLARATION OF LIANGJIE LI IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND 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. Limited ("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 a well-known source of women’s clothing in the United States and has been the subject of rampant infringement through online platforms such as Alibaba, Walmart, Amazon, Temu, eBay, Aliexpress, and TikTok (the “Platform”), which is the online sales platform at issue in this action. These are some of the 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 all defaulted Schedule “A” Defendants (the “Defaulting Defendants”) in this action. The Defaulting Defendants are accused of intentionally and willfully infringing Plaintiff’s federally registered copyrights asserted in this action: (1) VA0002380492, (2) VA0002384827, (3) VA0002413196, (4) VA0002381842, (5) VA0002384838 (6) VA0002413196, (7) VA0002413202 and (8) VA0002379934. (the “Copyright Protected Images”).

7. It is without question that the Defaulting Defendants have 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 Defendants’ online stores maintained with the TikTok Platform (the “Online Stores”). Moreover, the Defaulting Defendants have unquestionably been operating their Online Stores using the misappropriated Copyright Protected Images through a sophisticated network utilizing a highly developed supply chain capable of supplying thousands of competing products featuring an array of Plaintiff’s textile patterns and designs that could not otherwise be accomplished on an individual basis.

8. The basic nature of the copyright infringement scheme employed demonstrates that the Defaulting Defendants not only knew of the impropriety of their conduct but had to implement

their scheme through sophisticated sources and established supply chains. This is the only possible scenario under which the Defaulting Defendants could immediately procure, without authorization, Plaintiff's new copyright protected product images and offer them for sale through their Online Stores.

9. The Defaulting Defendants have intentionally used the Copyright Protected Images for soliciting their competing Rotita product sales on a Platform that Plaintiff does not, and has not, utilized to sell its authentic products.

10. 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, over twenty (20) 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.

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 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 TikTok despite Plaintiff not selling authentic "Rotita" brand products on the platform. Based on the foregoing, I would estimate that the Defaulting Defendants' 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.

12. The Defaulting Defendants named in the company's copyright infringement enforcement actions are engaged in the practice of copying Plaintiff's copyright protected product images after they are first displayed on the company's website and then associating these images with sale and promotion of unauthorized 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 Defaulting Defendants. Simply put, Plaintiff maintains that the Defaulting 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 competing products being sold on the Defaulting Defendants' Platform storefronts.

13. Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, irreparable harm through the Defaulting 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.

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

Executed on September 19, 2025, in Hong Kong.

By: /s/ Liangjie Li
LIANGJIE LI

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 19th day of September 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, TikTok.

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

No.	Name	Contact Information
1	enjoymall	460266252@qq.com
2	Ginoa	tanjingnan@hibossshop.com
3	Anja Anja	619409314@qq.com
4	DONWORD	1007929243@qq.com
5	Kaibom	cxq8412@163.com
6	Mewwos9866	xiangwqwqzt9177@163.com
7	Pengze Clothes	1826065541@qq.com
8	Nutricia Shop	zbow112611@gmail.com
9	GivensonStore12	cineasgivenson@gmail.com
10	BRISTL'S STORE	460266252@qq.com
11	ERHGERGEW	biaoerday8993@163.com
12	HERHGESGVAW	ranwenyongres9@163.com
13	Xinzhiyu Clothing	137894329@qq.com
14	ROBO7222	quanzbf0@163.com
15	BAHSDGSDB	tanr5859470@163.com
16	Colour Dress	1637102811@qq.com
17	SEXYAPPAREL23	sexyapparel23@gmail.com