

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

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRESTONANDPAYTON.COM,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:26-00223-FUV-LKM

Honorable Franklin U. Valderrama

Magistrate Laura K. McNally

PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT

Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Limited (“Plaintiff”) hereby moves for Default Judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b) against the Defendant, prestonandpayton.com (“Defendant”). Plaintiff files herewith a Memorandum of Law in support, Declaration of Joseph W. Droter, and Declaration of Liangjie Li, and accompanying Exhibit. Plaintiff’s Motion for Default Judgment disposes of the case.

DATED: May 15, 2026

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ William R. Brees

William R. Brees (FL Bar No. 98886)

Joseph W. Droter (Bar No. 6329630)

BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC

233 S. Wacker Drive, 44th Floor, #57

Chicago, IL 60606

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

william@bayramoglu-legal.com

Joseph@bayramoglu-legal.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 15th day of May 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing 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 is listed below and provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <http://blointernetenforcement.com>.

By: /s/ William R. Brees
William R. Brees (FL Bar No. 98886)
BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC

Defendant Name	Email Address
prestonandpayton.com	info@prestonandpayton.com

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

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRESTONANDPAYTON.COM,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:26-00223-FUV-LKM

Honorable Franklin U. Valderrama

Magistrate Laura K. McNally

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

Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Limited (“Plaintiff”) hereby submits this Memorandum of Law in support of its Motion for Default Judgment (the “Motion”) pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55 (“Rule 55”) against the Defendant, prestonandpayton.com, (the “Defendant”). Plaintiff’s Motion is made and based upon this Memorandum of Law, the Declaration of Joseph W. Droter (“Droter 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 Default Judgment disposes of the case.

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff’s request for Default Judgment is straightforward. On March 25, 2026, the Court authorized electronic service on the Defendant in connection with issuing Plaintiff’s Motion for Electronic Service and Expedited Discovery [Dkt. No. 19]. Plaintiff completed service on Defendant and filed a Return of Service on April 10, 2026 [Dkt. No. 22]. The deadline to respond to the Complaint was May 1, 2026.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)(1)(A) ("Rule 12(a)(1)(A)"), the Defendant had twenty-one (21) days to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Complaint in this action. To date, the Defendant has not answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff's Complaint. (Droter Decl. ¶ 4). 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). Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court was compelled to enter default pursuant to Rule 55(a) against the Defaulting Defendant, and Default was granted on May 13, 2026 [Dkt. No. 24].

Pursuant to Rule 55(b)(2), Plaintiff now also respectfully moves this Court for entry of a default judgment finding the Defendant liable on all counts asserted in Plaintiff's Complaint [Dkt. No. 1]. These asserted counts include claims for Copyright Infringement (Count I) [Dkt. 1 at ¶ 50-70], and Violation of Illinois Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act (Count II) [Dkt. 1 at ¶ 71-78]. In connection with its asserted claims for relief, Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c) against the Defendant for each infringement of the images protected by Plaintiff's federally registered copyrights (the "Copyright Protected Photographs"), specifically the following 31 U.S. Copyright Registration Nos.:

The 31 Infringed Copyrights		
VA0002438098	VA0002438694	VA0002438710
VA0002438681	VA0002436255	VA0002436257
VA0002379894	VA0002436262	VA0002434999
VA0002414224	VA0002416896	VA0002417353
VA0002437620	VA0002416248	VA0002436246
VA0002435957	VA0002435099	VA0002413416
VA0002414407	VA0002414345	VA0002413433
VA0002413407	VA0002413402	VA0002413452
VA0002413374	VA0002417875	VA0002437552
VA0002435523	VA0002438663	VA0002439037
VA0002417354		

(Droter Decl. ¶ 5). Plaintiff additionally requests the Court issue a permanent injunction against the Defendant. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 502(a).

As alleged in the Complaint, the Defendant has displayed, without authorization, the Copyright Protected Photographs on its website prestonandpayton.com (the “Website”) to market and sell competing products using Plaintiff’s authentic Rotita Copyright Protected Photographs, thereby deceiving public consumers as to the quality, nature, and source of goods being purchased (Droter Decl. ¶ 6). Moreover, the Defendant is alleged to be part of a coordinated, sophisticated product network that utilizes a common supply chain and manufacturing source to fulfill consumer orders for competing products by displaying, without authorization, Plaintiff’s Copyright Protected Photographs on their online websites. (Droter Decl. ¶¶ 11-12). These circumstances clearly demonstrate the Defendant has willfully and intentionally infringed Plaintiff’s Copyright Protected Photographs, thereby supporting Plaintiff’s request for enhanced statutory damages under the Copyright Act. (*Id.*)

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.*] [Dkts. 1-2, 1-3] ; *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). Accordingly, it is unquestionable that the 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.

On January 8, 2026, Plaintiff filed its Complaint in this action alleging, among other claims, Copyright Infringement (Count I), and Violation of the Illinois Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act (Count). On March 25, 2026, this Court authorized electronic service [Dkt. No. 19]. Defendant was properly served with the Complaint and all supporting documents via electronic service on April 10, 2026. [Dkt. No. 22] Specifically, the Defendant was required to answer or

otherwise respond to the Complaint on or before May 1, 2026 [*Id.*] As such, the Defendant had twenty-one (21) days to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to Rule 12(a)(1)(A). To date, the Defendant has not answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff's Complaint. (Droter Decl. ¶ 4). Accordingly, default judgment should be entered pursuant to Rule 55(b) against the Defendant.

C. 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 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 Defendant for copyright infringement, as asserted in the Complaint [Dkt. No. 1].

As argued below, Plaintiff is entitled to the following remedies through the issuance of a default judgment against the Defendant: (1) an award of statutory damages and profits of \$5,000.00 per Copyright infringed under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1), totaling thirty-one (31) Copyrights for \$155,000.00; (2) an enhanced award of statutory damages of \$15,000.00 per copyright infringed

for willful infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2) totaling thirty-one (31) Copyrights for \$465,000.00; and (3) entry of a permanent injunction pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502(a).

D. Plaintiff is Entitled to the Relief Requested.

Through entry of default, Plaintiff has established that Defendant is liable for intentionally and willfully infringing the Copyright Protected Photographs. 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 Photographs; (2) Plaintiff's request that any statutory damage award be enhanced based on the Defendant's willful copyright infringement; (3) and Plaintiff's right to issuance of a permanent injunction against the 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 Defendant. Plaintiff is entitled to such relief for the Defendant's infringement of Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs, which it maintains was done willfully and intentionally (Li Decl. ¶ 5).

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 Photographs. 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 Photographs 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. 1-1]. Moreover, Plaintiff has set forth considerable factual allegations establishing the Defendant has infringed Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs [Dkt. No. 1-2]. Accordingly, Plaintiff has established that the Defendant has infringed Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs.

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 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 (Droter Decl. ¶ 7.)

Specifically, Plaintiff has neither obtained, nor is the 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 Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 504(b). As such, there is no verifiable information concerning the Defendant's gross infringing sales of their competing products or the associated deductible expenses from same (Droter Decl. ¶ 7). Plaintiff has requested \$5,000 be entered against Defendant per Copyright infringed (31 total Copyrights), enhanced to \$15,000 per Copyright infringed (31 Copyrights total) and attached its breakdown as **Exhibit 1** to the Droter Declaration filed herewith. (Droter 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 Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff asserts that it is entitled to an award of statutory damages in the amounts requested in Exhibit 1 of the Droter Declaration in this action (Droter Decl. ¶ 7, 12, Exhibit 1). First, the 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 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 Photographs 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 Defaulted Defendant.

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

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court award statutory damages against the Defendant per Copyright Infringed (31 Copyrights total). As set forth in Plaintiff's supporting documentation, the Defendant in this action should be found liable for \$5,000 per Copyright infringed for statutory damages under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1) (\$155,000.00 total), which should be treble enhanced because of their willful infringements of the Copyright Protected Photographs (\$465,000.00 total) (Droter Decl. ¶ 12, Ex. 1).

2. Plaintiff is entitled to enhanced statutory damages.

Next, the circumstances of the Defendant's infringement clearly support awarding an enhanced statutory damage award of, at least, treble damages against them. Simply put, the 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 Defendant has engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyright Protected Photographs (Droter Decl. ¶¶ 11-12). In this regard, Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs, often representing recent product releases, have appeared on the Defendant's online stores maintained with the Website. (Li Decl. ¶ 7.) In addition, defendants in multiple copyright enforcement actions in this judicial district, which includes the 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. (Droter Decl. ¶ 8). These circumstances reveal an overall strategy by all non-appearing defendants, likely including the Defendant, to simply cut their losses where Plaintiff has a high likelihood of success, and bask in the security that any judgment issued against them will almost certainly not be collectable. 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 Defendant on the grounds that they should serve as a deterrent to future conduct. *Id.* at 1229-30. Simply put, the Defendant is watching the results of Plaintiff's copyright infringement enforcement actions in this judicial district. Defendant's conduct demonstrates an intentional

wiliness to ignore the Court's authority to impose significant statutory damages in this action. The Court needs to send a message to the Defendant, and all other similar infringers, that they will incur substantial liability for their actions. In doing so, hopefully the Defendant, or other similar infringers monitoring this case, will post this anticipated reward on the 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, \$15,000 per Copyright infringed. As set forth in Plaintiff's supporting documentation **Exhibit 1** to the Droter Declaration, the Defendant in this action should be found liable because of their willful infringement of the Copyright Protected Photographs (Droter Decl. ¶ 12, Ex. 1). Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court enter an award of \$5,000.00 per Copyright infringed (31 total) against Defendant, prestonandpayton.com, in statutory damages, which should be enhanced for willful infringement to \$15,000.00 per Copyright infringed against Defendant, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2).

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

Next, Plaintiff is entitled to the entry of a permanent injunction against the Defendant 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 Defendant have willfully reproduced and publicly displayed Plaintiff's thirty-one (31) Copyrights without authorization in connection with online product listings (Droter 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 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 Defendant 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 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 Defendant from engaging in unlawful conduct, namely the unauthorized use and display of Plaintiff's Copyrighted Photographs. The 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 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 Defendant, and all persons acting in concert with them, from directly or indirectly infringing Plaintiff's Copyrighted Photographs.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully request entry of default and default judgment against the Defendant pursuant to Rule 55(b). In granting its request, Plaintiff asks the Court to award the following: (1) statutory damages of \$5,000.00 per Copyright infringed against Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1) (31 Copyrights for \$155,000.00); (2) enhanced statutory damages of \$15,000.00 against Defendant based on its willful infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2) (31 Copyrights for \$465,000.00); (3) issuance of a permanent injunction

against the Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502(a); and (4) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: May 15, 2026

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ William R. Brees

William R. Brees (FL Bar No. 98886)

Joseph W. Droter (Bar No. 6329630)

BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC

233 S. Wacker Drive, 44th Floor, #57

Chicago, IL 60606

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

william@bayramoglu-legal.com

Joseph@bayramoglu-legal.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 15th day of May 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing 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 is listed below and provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <http://blointernetenforcement.com>.

By: /s/ William R. Brees
William R. Brees (FL Bar No. 98886)
BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC

Defendant Name	Email Address
prestonandpayton.com	info@prestonandpayton.com

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

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRESTONANDPAYTON.COM,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:26-00223-FUV-LKM

Honorable Franklin U. Valderrama

Magistrate Laura K. McNally

**DECLARATION OF JOSEPH W. DROTER IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR 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 Judgment against the Defendant, prestonandpayton.com (the "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. Limited ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration from my matters within my own knowledge unless stated otherwise.

4. I hereby certify that the Defendant has 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 10, 2026, which is reflected in the Return of Summons filed in this case [Dkt. No. 22]. To date, Defendant has not 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:

The 31 Infringed Copyrights		
VA0002438098	VA0002438694	VA0002438710
VA0002438681	VA0002436255	VA0002436257
VA0002379894	VA0002436262	VA0002434999
VA0002414224	VA0002416896	VA0002417353
VA0002437620	VA0002416248	VA0002436246
VA0002435957	VA0002435099	VA0002413416
VA0002414407	VA0002414345	VA0002413433
VA0002413407	VA0002413402	VA0002413452
VA0002413374	VA0002417875	VA0002437552
VA0002435523	VA0002438663	VA0002439037
VA0002417354		

(the "Copyright Protected Photographs").

6. As alleged in the Complaint, the Defendant has displayed, without authorization, the Copyright Protected Photographs on their website prestonandpayton.com (the "Website") to market and sell competing products using Plaintiff's authentic Rotita Copyright Protected Photographs, thereby deceiving public consumers as to the quality, nature, and source of goods being purchased.

7. The Defendant was provided with notice of these proceedings and, apparently, intentionally elected not to appear and defend this action. As a result of the 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 Defendant. Attached as **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration, which shows email address, Statutory Damages Request (enhanced for willful infringement per copyright), and Copyrights infringed on.

8. In addition, defendants in multiple copyright enforcement actions in this judicial district, actively monitor and post information on 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.

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

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

11. Plaintiff has alleged, and has offered proof, that the Defendant has engaged in the infringement of the Copyright Protected Photographs. Moreover, the basic nature of the copyright infringement scheme employed demonstrates that the 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 Defendant's knowledge and intentional infringement of Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs. Accordingly, Plaintiff should be awarded statutory damages, as described in **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration, with treble the

enhancement against Defaulted Defendant based on their willful infringement of the Copyright Protected Photographs.

13. My office, with assistance from our client and those assisting our client, investigated the infringing activities of the Defendant, including attempting to identify their contact information. Our investigation confirmed that the Defendant is primarily domiciled in outside the United States. As such, I am informed and believe that the 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.

Executed on May 15, 2026, in Chicago, Illinois.

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 15th day of May 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing 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 is listed below and provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <http://blointernetenforcement.com>.

By: /s/ William R. Brees
William R. Brees (FL Bar No. 98886)
BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC

Defendant Name	Email Address
prestonandpayton.com	info@prestonandpayton.com

Exhibit 1

Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Limited v. prestonandpayton.com
1:26-cv-00223

Defendant: prestonandpayton.com

Email: info@prestonandpayton.com

Defendant Name	31 Copyrights Infringed 34 Photographs	Statutory Request Amount	Enhanced 3x for Willful Infringement (per copyright infringed)
prestonandpayton.com	VA0002438098	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002438681	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002379894	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002414224	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002437620	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002435957	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002414407	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002413407	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002413374	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002435523	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002417354	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002438694	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002436255	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002436262	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002416896	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002416248	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002435099	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002414345	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002413402	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002417875	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002438663	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002438710	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002436257	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002434999	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002417353	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002436246	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002413416	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002413433	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002413452	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002437552	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	VA0002439037	\$5,000.00	\$15,000.00
	TOTAL:	\$155,000.00	\$465,000.00

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

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRESTONANDPAYTON.COM,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:26-00223-FUV-LKM

Honorable Franklin U. Valderrama

Magistrate Laura K. McNally

**DECLARATION OF LIANGJIE LI IN SUPPORT OF
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 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. Plaintiff seeks an award of statutory damages against the defaulted Defendant per copyright infringed (the "Defaulting Defendant") in this action. The Defaulting Defendant is

accused of intentionally and willfully infringing Plaintiff's Federally Registered Copyrights asserted in this action:

The 31 Infringed Copyrights		
VA0002438098	VA0002438694	VA0002438710
VA0002438681	VA0002436255	VA0002436257
VA0002379894	VA0002436262	VA0002434999
VA0002414224	VA0002416896	VA0002417353
VA0002437620	VA0002416248	VA0002436246
VA0002435957	VA0002435099	VA0002413416
VA0002414407	VA0002414345	VA0002413433
VA0002413407	VA0002413402	VA0002413452
VA0002413374	VA0002417875	VA0002437552
VA0002435523	VA0002438663	VA0002439037
VA0002417354		

(the "Copyright Protected Photographs").

6. Rotita is a well-known source of women's clothing in the United States and has been the subject of rampant competing sales using its copyrighted photos and images through online websites such as Defendant here, prestonandpayton.com (the "Website") and third-party platforms such as Tiktok, Amazon, Walmart, Alibaba, eBay, Aliexpress, and Temu. Plaintiff has not licensed nor allowed Defendant to use any of the Copyright Protected Photographs in any capacity.

7. It is without question that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyright Protected Photographs. In this regard, Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs, often representing recent product releases, have appeared on the prestonandpayton.com Website.

8. 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. This is the only possible

scenario under which the Defaulting Defendant could procure, without authorization, Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photographs and offer them for sale through their Website. In addition, the Defaulting Defendant has intentionally used the Copyright Protected Photographs for soliciting competing Rotita product sales on a Platform that Plaintiff does not, and has not, licensed 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 Photographs.

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 Photographs. Based on the foregoing, I would estimate that the Defaulting Defendant's Website operates at a net profit of between 40% to 50%. I believe that a disgorgement of the Defaulting Defendant's profits would fall within the net profit range. However, it is impossible to definitively calculate the Defaulting Defendant's total sales on the Website 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 is engaged in the practice of copying Plaintiff's copyright protected product photographs after they are displayed on the company's website and then associating these images with sale and promotion of competing products, 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 the named Defaulting Defendant.

12. 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 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 May 15, 2026, in Hong Kong.

By: /s/ Liangjie Li
LIANGJIE LI

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 15th day of May 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing 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 is listed below and provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <http://blointernetenforcement.com>.

By: /s/ William R. Brees
William R. Brees (FL Bar No. 98886)
BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC

Defendant Name	Email Address
prestonandpayton.com	info@prestonandpayton.com