

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

Wumei Lin,

Plaintiff,

v.

TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:25-cv-13649-LAH-DPM**

**Honorable LaShonda A. Hunt**

**Magistrate Daniel P. McLaughlin**

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

Plaintiff Wumei Lin (“Plaintiff”) hereby moves for Entry of Default and Default Judgment against the Defendant, TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP (the “Defaulting Defendant”). Plaintiff files a Memorandum of Law in support, Declaration of Joseph W. Droter, Declaration of Wumei Lin, and accompanying Exhibit. Plaintiff’s Motion for Entry of Default and Default Judgment disposes of the case.

DATED: February 2, 2026

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter

Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)

Joseph W. Droter (Bar No. 6329630)

**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 2nd day of February 2026, 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 (Bar No. 6329630)

<b>Store Name</b>	<b>Store ID</b>	<b>Email</b>
TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP	7496006947777186078	admin@huorunkaitk.top

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

Wumei Lin,

Plaintiff,

v.

TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:25-cv-13649-LAH-DPM**

**Honorable LaShonda A. Hunt**

**Magistrate Daniel P. McLaughlin**

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

Plaintiff Wumei Lin (“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 Defendant, TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP (“Defaulting Defendant”), which has been separately listed in Exhibit 1 to the accompanying Declaration of Joseph W. Droter (the “Droter Decl.”). Plaintiff’s Motion is made and based upon this Memorandum of Law, the Droter Declaration, the Declaration of Wumei Lin (the “Lin 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**

On December 11, 2025, the Court authorized electronic service via email on Defendant [Dkt. No. 27]. Plaintiff completed service on Defendant on January 9, 2026 [Dkt. No. 32] by sending an email to Defendant containing the Summons and the Complaint as well as a link to both and filed a Return of Service on January 9, 2026 [Dkt. No. 32]. The deadline to respond to the Complaint was January 30, 2026.

Plaintiff seeks an award of \$5,000 statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c) against the Defaulting Defendant, which Plaintiff requests to be enhanced to \$12,500 for their willful infringement to of the federally registered copyright asserted in this action, VA0002441336 (the “Copyrighted Image”). (Droter Decl. ¶ 5.) Plaintiff additionally requests the Court to issue a permanent injunction against the Defaulting Defendant. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 502(a).

## **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)(1)(A), the Defaulting Defendant 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).

## **III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

As alleged in the First Amended Complaint, the Defaulting Defendant has publicly displayed unlicensed and unauthorized reproductions of Plaintiff’s Copyrighted Image on the TikTok online sales platform (the “Platform”) to market and sell products that compete with Plaintiff’s licensees using Plaintiff’s Copyrighted Image. Thereby deceiving public consumers as to the quality, nature, and source of goods being purchased. (Droter Decl. ¶ 6.) Moreover, the Defaulting Defendant is alleged to be operating as part of a coordinated, sophisticated network that utilizes a common supply chain and manufacturing source to fulfill consumer orders. As of the filing of this Motion, more than twenty-one days (21) have expired since electronic service was effectuated on the Defendant, (Droter Decl. ¶ 4.) To date, the Defaulting Defendant has not 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 Defendant

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 defendant is 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 Defendant has willfully and intentionally infringed Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image, 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. 12 at ¶ 6-11.] 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. [Dkt. No. 12 at 7-12]; *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 Defendant is 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 clearly meets these

requirements. Here, Plaintiff filed its Complaint alleging, among other claims, Copyright Infringement (Count I). [12 at ¶ 36-51]. Defendant was properly served with the Complaint, Summons, and all supporting documents via electronic service on January 9, 2026. [Dkt. No. 32] The Defaulting Defendant had twenty-one (21) days to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint pursuant to Rule 12(a)(1)(A). Here, the Defaulting Defendant was required to answer or otherwise respond to the First Amended Complaint on or before January 30, 2026. [*Id.*] As of the filing of this Motion, more than twenty-one (21) days have expired since electronic service was effectuated on the Defendant. (Droter Decl. ¶ 4.) To date, the Defaulting Defendant has not 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 Defendant.

**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 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). 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 Defendant: (1) an award of \$5,000 in statutory damages and profits against the Defendant for copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); (2) an award

of enhanced \$12,500 in statutory damages against the Defaulting Defendant for willful infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2); and (3) entry of a permanent injunction pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502(a).

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

Plaintiff is entitled to such relief for the Defaulting Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image, which it maintains was done willfully and intentionally (Droter Decl. ¶ 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 Copyrighted Image. 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 Copyrighted Image in its First Amended Complaint [Dkt. No. 12]. and has supplied the Court with a summary of all registrations issued by the United States Copyright Office [Dkt. No. 12-1].

Moreover, Plaintiff has set forth considerable factual allegations establishing the Defaulting Defendant has infringed Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image. [Dkt. No. 12-2]. Therefore, the Defaulting Defendant has infringed Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image.

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 Defendant's 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, Plaintiff has neither obtained, nor is the Defaulting Defendant participating in these proceedings, so that the Court can be provided with the infringer's deductible expenses related to the sale of the competing products associated with the unauthorized use and public display of Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image. *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 using Plaintiff's copyrights or the associated deductible expenses from same. (Droter Decl. ¶ 7.) Moreover, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, irreparable harm through the

Defaulting Defendant's unauthorized use of its federally registered Copyrighted Image asserted in this action. (Lin Decl. ¶ 11) This results in the direct harm to Plaintiff's brand reputation and loss of exclusive licenses, both of which are harms that are virtually impossible to ascertain the resulting economic loss. (*Id.*) 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 Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff asserts that it is entitled to an award of \$5,000 in statutory damages against the Defaulting Defendant and submits an analysis showing the Defaulting Defendant, the copyright infringed, and the enhanced statutory damages requested (Droter Decl. ¶ 12, Exhibit 1).

In this case the Defaulting Defendant was provided with notice of these proceedings and, apparently, intentionally elected not to appear and defend (Droter 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.*) The Defaulting Defendant has intentionally used the Copyrighted Image for soliciting their competing product sales without obtaining a license and have never been authorized to use the Copyrighted Image. (Lin Decl. ¶ 8) It is impossible to definitively calculate the Defaulting Defendant's total sales on the Platform through their Online Store or to ascertain their expenses related to their infringing sales because they have failed to appear, defend, or otherwise participate in this action. (*Id.* ¶ 9) These facts unquestionably support Plaintiff's request statutory damages of the infringed Copyrighted Image against the Defaulted Defendant.

The actions 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

Copyrighted Image. In this regard, Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs, without a license, have appeared on the Defaulting Defendant's online stores maintained with the Platform. (Lin Decl. ¶ 6.) 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) in an amount not less than \$5,000.00 against the Defaulting Defendant per infringed Copyrighted Image (Droter Decl. ¶ 12, Ex. 1).

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

Here, the Defaulting Defendant's infringement clearly supports awarding an enhanced statutory damage award against them. The Defaulting Defendant's infringing conduct in this action are willful and continue to infringe even after notice of the lawsuit, thereby justifying enhanced damages under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2). Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyrighted Image. (Droter Decl. ¶ 5, 12.) Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image, without obtaining a license, have appeared on each the Defaulting Defendant's online store maintained with the Platform. (Lin Decl. ¶ 6.) The Defaulting Defendant has clearly been operating their online stores using the unauthorized and unlicensed Copyrighted Image. Upon information and belief, 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). (Droter 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 Defendant, 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 (Droter 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. Here, the Defaulting Defendant is watching the results of Plaintiff's copyright infringement enforcement actions in this judicial district (Droter 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 Copyrighted Image. (*Id.* ¶ 9.) The Defaulting Defendant has 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 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 award on the [www.SellerDefense.cn](http://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 \$5,000 statutory damages against the Defaulted Defendant per infringed Copyrighted Image, which should be enhanced to \$12,500 for willful infringement per Defaulted Defendant per infringed Copyright Protected Work, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2). A Defendant request analysis is provided as Exhibit 1 to the Droter Declaration (Droter Decl. ¶ 12, Exhibit 1).

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

Next, Plaintiff is entitled to the entry of a permanent injunction against the Defaulting Defendants pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502(a), which authorizes courts to “grant temporary and final injunctions on such terms as it may deem reasonable to prevent or restrain infringement of a copyright.”

In determining whether permanent injunctive relief is appropriate, courts apply the four-factor test set forth in *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006), requiring a showing that: (1) Plaintiff has suffered an irreparable injury; (2) remedies available at law are inadequate to compensate for that injury; (3) the balance of hardships favors injunctive relief; and (4) the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction. Each factor weighs decisively in favor of granting injunctive relief here.

First, Plaintiff has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm absent injunctive relief. 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, the Defaulting Defendant has willfully reproduced and publicly displayed Plaintiff’s Copyrighted Image without authorization in connection with online product listings. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 5.) Such conduct causes loss of control over Plaintiff’s copyrighted works, damage to brand goodwill, and consumer confusion; harms that are inherently difficult to quantify and not fully compensable through monetary damages alone. Moreover, the Defaulting Defendant’s failure to appear or participate in this action demonstrates a substantial risk of continued infringement absent court-ordered relief.

Second, legal remedies are inadequate. 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. See *Virgin Records Am. Inc. v. Johnson*, where 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. 441 F. Supp. 2d 963. Because the Defaulting Defendant has elected not to appear, Plaintiff lacks any meaningful ability to monitor, deter, or prevent future infringement through monetary relief alone. Courts routinely recognize that where defendants operate anonymous or foreign-based online storefronts, monetary damages are insufficient to prevent continued unlawful conduct.

Third, the balance of hardships strongly favors Plaintiff. Plaintiff seeks only to prohibit the Defaulting Defendant from engaging in unlawful conduct, namely the unauthorized use and display of Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image. The Defaulting Defendant has no legitimate interest in continuing infringing activities and therefore will suffer no cognizable hardship from compliance with a permanent injunction.

Finally, public interest is served by the enforcement of federal copyright laws and the prevention of consumer deception. Granting injunctive relief promotes respect for intellectual property rights and discourages future infringement, particularly in the online marketplace context.

Because the Defaulting Defendant has failed to respond, defend, or otherwise participate in this action, and because the record establishes a strong likelihood of continued infringement absent injunctive relief, entry of a permanent injunction is appropriate and warranted under 17 U.S.C. § 502(a). Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court enter a permanent

injunction prohibiting the Defaulting Defendant, and all persons acting in concert with it, from directly or indirectly infringing Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image.

**V. CONCLUSION**

Under Rule 55(b)(2), Plaintiff respectfully requests 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) [12 at ¶ 36-51]. In granting its request, Plaintiff asks the Court to award the following: (1) \$5,000 in statutory damages per Defaulting Defendant per infringed Copyright pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); (2) enhanced statutory damages of \$12,500 against the Defaulting Defendant per infringed Copyrighted Image based on their 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); and (4) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: February 2, 2026

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  
joseph@bayramoglu-legal.com  
Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 2nd day of February 2026, 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 (Bar No. 6329630)

<b>Store Name</b>	<b>Store ID</b>	<b>Email</b>
TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP	7496006947777186078	admin@huorunkaitk.top

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

Wumei Lin,

Plaintiff,

v.

TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:25-cv-13649-LAH-DPM**

**Honorable LaShonda A. Hunt**

**Magistrate Daniel P. McLaughlin**

**DECLARATION OF JOSEPH W. DROTER, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT**

I, Joseph W. Droter, 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 Defendant, TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP ("Defaulting Defendant"), which has been separately listed in Exhibit 1 to this Declaration.

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 Wumei Lin ("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) has failed to plead or otherwise defend this action within twenty-one (21) days after being served with the Summons and First Amended Complaint in this action in violation of

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)(1)(A). Specifically, the Defendant was served with copies of the Summons and First Amended Complaint via electronic service authorized by the Court on January 9, 2026, which is reflected in the Return of Summons filed in this case [Dkt. No. 32]. As of the filing of this Motion, more than twenty-one (21) days have expired since electronic service was effectuated on the Defendant. The Defaulting Defendant has not answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint in this action.

5. Plaintiff's asserted claims for relief in this action involve the intentional, willful infringement of the following Federally Registered Copyright, VA0002441336 (the "Copyrighted Image").

6. As alleged in the First Amended Complaint, the Defaulting Defendant has displayed, without authorization, the Copyrighted Image on the TikTok online sales platform (the "Platform") to market and sell products using Plaintiff's authentic Copyrighted Image through their online store (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 Statutory Damages Request based on copyright infringement. 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 Defendant, 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 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.

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 Defendant for each alleged infringement of the Copyrighted Image.

10. Such an award precludes the Defaulting Defendant from shielding themselves from monetary responsibility for the collective infringement of common Copyrighted Image. *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 for an enhanced statutory damage award as described in **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration for their infringement of the Copyrighted Image.

11. Plaintiff has alleged, and has offered proof, that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the infringement of the Copyrighted Image. Moreover, the basic nature of the copyright infringement scheme employed demonstrates that the Defaulting Defendant not only knew of the impropriety of their conduct but had to implement their scheme through sophisticated sources and established supply chains.

12. The presented facts not only establish the Defaulting Defendant's knowledge and intentional infringement of Plaintiff's Copyrighted Image. Accordingly, Plaintiff should be awarded statutory damages as described in **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration, with the enhancement

against Defaulted Defendant based on their continuing willful infringement after receiving notice of this lawsuit of the Copyrighted Image.

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 active-duty members of the U.S. armed forces.

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

Executed this 2nd day of February 2026, in Chicago, Illinois.

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter  
JOSEPH W. DROTER, ESQ.  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES, LLC**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 2nd day of February 2026, 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 (Bar No. 6329630)

Store Name	Store ID	Email
TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP	7496006947777186078	admin@huorunkaitk.top

# Exhibit 1

Wumei Lin v. TENGRENHANGMAO-SHOP  
1:25-cv-13649

<b>Seller Name/Defendant Seller ID Contact Information</b>	<b>Product ID</b>	<b>Copyright Infringed</b>	<b>Statutory Amount Requested</b>	<b>Enhanced for Willful Infringement</b>
TENGRENHANGMAO -SHOP 7496006947777186078 admin@huorunkaitk.top	1731096448023695646	VA0002441336	\$5,000.00	<b>\$12,500.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>				<b>\$12,500.00</b>

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

Wumei Lin,

Plaintiff,

v.

TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:25-cv-13649-LAH-DPM**

**Honorable LaShonda A. Hunt**

**Magistrate Daniel P. McLaughlin**

**DECLARATION OF WUMEI LIN IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT**

I, Wumei Lin, of Shenzhen City, Guangdong Province 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 owner of the photos protected by copyright registration VA0002441336 (the "Copyrighted Image"). I make this declaration from my matters within my own personal knowledge unless stated otherwise.

4. Plaintiff licenses the Copyrighted Image to certain companies for use in connection with the advertising and sale of clothing and apparel. The Defaulting Defendant is not authorized to reproduce, distribute, or display the Copyrighted Image.

5. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory damages against the Defendant (the “Defaulting Defendant”) in this action. The Defaulting Defendant is accused of intentionally and willfully infringing Plaintiff’s following federally registered copyrights asserted in this action: VA0002441336 (the “Copyrighted Image”).

6. It is without question that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyrighted Image. In this regard, Plaintiff’s Copyrighted Image, without obtaining a license, has appeared on the Defaulting Defendant’s online store maintained with the Platform (the “Online Store”).

7. The basic nature of the copyright infringement scheme employed demonstrates that the Defaulting Defendant not only knew of the impropriety of their conduct but had to implement their scheme through sophisticated sources and established supply chains.

8. The Defaulting Defendant has intentionally used the Copyrighted Image for soliciting their competing product sales without obtaining a license and have never been authorized to use the Copyrighted Image.

9. It is impossible to definitively calculate the Defaulting Defendant’s 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.

10. The Defaulting Defendant named in Plaintiff’s copyright infringement enforcement actions is engaged in the practice of copying Plaintiff’s Copyrighted Image and then associating these images with sale and promotion of unauthorized products of questionable quality, thereby deceiving consumers – including the citizens of the State of Illinois. Plaintiff maintains that the Defaulting Defendant is acting in concert, pursuant to a common scheme, whereby they copy the Copyrighted Image, without authorization, or such unauthorized images are being provided by the

same common source associated with manufacturing the competing products being sold on the Defaulting Defendant's Platform storefront.

11. Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, irreparable harm through the Defaulting Defendant's unauthorized use of its federally registered copyright protected photographs asserted in this action. This results in the direct harm to Plaintiff's brand reputation and loss of exclusive licenses, 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 February 2, 2026, in Shenzhen City, Guangdong Province of the People's Republic of China.

By: /s/ Wumei Lin  
WUMEI LIN

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 2nd day of February 2026, 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 (Bar No. 6329630)

<b>Store Name</b>	<b>Store ID</b>	<b>Email</b>
TENGRENSHANGMAO-SHOP	749600694777186078	admin@huorunkaitk.top