

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

SHENZHEN DAISILI COMMERCIAL CO.,  
LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:26-cv-00944-SLE-MDW**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis**

**Magistrate M. David Weisman**

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

Plaintiff SHENZHEN DAISILI COMMERCIAL CO., LTD (“Plaintiff”) hereby moves for entry of Default and Default Judgment against the Defendant, wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes, (“Defendant”) listed below and separately listed in Exhibit "1" to the accompanying Declaration of Katherine M. Kuhn (the "Kuhn Decl."). Plaintiff files a Memorandum of Law in support. Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default and Default Judgment disposes of the case.

DATED: March 30, 2026

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
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 30th day of March 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing using the electronic case filing system. 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>, and a link to said website in the email provided by third-party, Temu.

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**  
233 S. Wacker Drive, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor, #57  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (702) 462-5973 | Fax: (702) 553-3404  
Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

<b>Defendant Name</b>	<b>Defendant Email Address</b>
wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes	361622201@qq.com

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

SHENZHEN DAISILI COMMERCIAL CO.,  
LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:26-cv-00944-SLE-MDW**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis**

**Magistrate M. David Weisman**

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

Plaintiff SHENZHEN DAISILI COMMERCIAL 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 Defendant, wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes, ("Defaulting Defendant"), which has 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 Bingzhi Hou (the "Hou 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 February 25, 2026, the Court authorized electronic service via email on Defendant along with issuing a Temporary Restraining Order and Order for Electronic Service [17, 18].

Plaintiff completed service on Defendant on March 6, 2026, and filed a Return of Service [24]. The deadline to respond to the First Amended Complaint was March 28, 2026.

Plaintiff seeks an award of \$5,000 statutory damages for copyright infringement against Defendant pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c), which Plaintiff requests to be enhanced to \$15,000 against Defendant for their willful infringement to of the following federally registered copyright asserted in this action: VA0002407256 (the "Copyright Protected Image"). (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 5). Plaintiff additionally requests that the Court 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 First Amended 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, here the Defaulting Defendant has publicly displayed unlicensed and unauthorized reproductions of Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Image on the Temu online sales platform (the "Platform") to market and sell competing products using Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Image on its online store on Temu ("Online Storefronts"). Thereby deceiving public consumers as to the quality, nature, and source of goods being purchased. (Kuhn 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, (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 4). To date, the Defaulting Defendant has not answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff's First Amended 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 Copyright Protected 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. 15 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 caused harm to Plaintiff's business within this judicial district. [*Id.*]; *see also uBID, Inc. v. GoDaddy Grp., Inc.*, 623 F.3d 421, 423-24 (7th Cir. 2010) (without benefit of an evidentiary hearing, plaintiff bears only the burden of making a prima facie case for personal jurisdiction; all of plaintiff's asserted facts should be accepted as true and any factual determinations should be resolved in its favor. In

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 First Amended Complaint alleging, among other claims, Copyright Infringement (Count I). [15 at 45-61]. Defendant was properly served with the First Amended Complaint, Summons, and all supporting documents via electronic service on March 6, 2026. [24]. The Defaulting Defendant had twenty-one (21) days to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's First Amended 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 March 28, 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. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 4). To date, the Defaulting Defendant has not answered or otherwise responded to Plaintiff's First Amended 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 for 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 Defendant is 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 against Defendant for copyright infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); (2) an award of enhanced \$15,000 in statutory damages 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).

**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 the company's Copyright Protected Image, which it maintains was done willfully and intentionally. (Kuhn 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 Copyright Protected 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 Copyright Protected Image in its First Amended Complaint [Dkt. 15]. and has supplied the Court with a summary of all registrations issued by the United States Copyright Office [Dkt. 15-1]. Moreover, Plaintiff has set forth considerable factual allegations establishing the Defaulting Defendant has infringed the company's Copyright Protected Image. [Dkt. 15-2]. Therefore, the Defaulting Defendant has infringed the company's Copyright Protected Image.

Next, Plaintiff is entitled to an award of statutory damages given the circumstances in this action. An award for 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. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 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 Copyright Protected Photographs. *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 copyright or the associated deductible expenses from same. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7). Moreover, Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, irreparable harm through the Defaulting Defendant's unauthorized use of its federally registered copyright protected photograph asserted in this action. (Hou 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 per Copyright infringed by Defendant and submits an analysis showing the Defaulting Defendant, the copyright infringed, the Online Storefront, and the enhanced statutory damages requested. (Kuhn 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. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 7). As a result of the Defaulting Defendant's intentional decision not to appear and defend this action, Plaintiff has been deprived of a meaningful opportunity to assess the true nature of its actual damages. (*Id.*). The Defaulting Defendant has intentionally used the Copyright Protected Image for soliciting their competing product sales without obtaining a license and has never been authorized to use the

Copyright Protected Photograph. (Hou 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 Copyright Protected 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 Copyright Protected Image. In this regard, Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Image, without a license, has appeared on the Defaulting Defendant's online store maintained with the Platform. (Hou 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 copyright infringed. (Kuhn 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 Copyright Protected Image. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 5, 12). Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Photograph, without obtaining a license, has appeared on the Defaulting Defendant's online store maintained with the Platform. (Hou Decl. ¶ 6). The Defaulting Defendant has clearly been operating their online store using the unauthorized and unlicensed

Copyright Protected 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). (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 by 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. (Kuhn Decl. ¶ 8).

Such circumstances support awarding Plaintiff for 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. (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 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 Defendant, which should be enhanced to \$15,000 for willful infringement, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(2). A 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 the entry of a permanent injunction against the Defaulting 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 Defaulting

Defendant has willfully reproduced and publicly displayed Plaintiff's Copyright Protected 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.

### 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 First Amended Complaint. [Dkt. 15]. These asserted counts include claims for Copyright Infringement (Count I). In granting its request, Plaintiff asks the Court to award the following: (1) \$5,000 in statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1); (2) enhanced statutory damages of \$15,000 based on Defendant's 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: March 30, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
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 30th day of March 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing using the electronic case filing system. 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>, and a link to said website in the email provided by third-party, Temu.

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**  
233 S. Wacker Drive, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor, #57  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (702) 462-5973 | Fax: (702) 553-3404  
Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

<b>Defendant Name</b>	<b>Defendant Email Address</b>
wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes	361622201@qq.com

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

SHENZHEN DAISILI COMMERCIAL CO.,  
LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:26-cv-00944-SLE-MDW**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis**

**Magistrate M. David Weisman**

**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 Defendant, wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes ("Defaulting Defendant"), which has been separately listed in Exhibit "1" to the Motion.

3. I am an attorney at law, duly admitted to practice before the Courts of the State of Illinois and the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. I am one of the attorneys for Plaintiff SHENZHEN DAISILI COMMERCIAL CO., LTD ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration from 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 March 6, 2026, which is reflected in the Return of Summons filed in this case. [24]. 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: VA0002407256 (the "Copyright Protected Image").

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

7. Plaintiff is entitled to statutory damages in this action as described in **Exhibit 1** to this Declaration, which shows the Statutory Damages Request based on the 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. Simply put, the Defaulting Defendant is 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 Defendant for each alleged infringement of the Copyright Protected Image.

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

11. Plaintiff has alleged, and has offered proof, that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the infringement of the Copyright Protected 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. This is the only possible scenario under which the

Defaulting Defendant could immediately procure, without authorization, Plaintiff's copyright protected product image and offer them for sale through their online store.

12. The presented facts not only establish the Defaulting Defendant's knowledge and intentional infringement of Plaintiff's Copyright Protected Image. 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 continuing willful infringement after receiving notice of this lawsuit of the Copyright Protected 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 an active-duty member of the U.S. armed forces.

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

DATED: March 30, 2026

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
Katherine M. Kuhn Esq.  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES, LLC**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 30th day of March 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing using the electronic case filing system. 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>, and a link to said website in the email provided by third-party, Temu.

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**  
233 S. Wacker Drive, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor, #57  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (702) 462-5973 | Fax: (702) 553-3404  
Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

<b>Defendant Name</b>	<b>Defendant Email Address</b>
wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes	361622201@qq.com

# Exhibit 1

Defaulted Defendant [1:26-cv-00944-SLE-MDW]

Defendant Name: wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes,

Defendant Email: 361622201@qq.com

<b>Temu Store Name Operated by Defendant</b>	<b>Temu mall ID</b>	<b>Copyright Infringed</b>	<b>Statutory Amount Requested</b>	<b>Enhanced for Willful Infringement Total Requested</b>
wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes,	634418210814410	VA0002407256	\$5,000	<b>\$15,000</b>
		<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$15,000.00</b>

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

SHENZHEN DAISILI COMMERCIAL CO.,  
LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:26-cv-00944-SLE-MDW**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis**

**Magistrate M. David Weisman**

**DECLARATION OF BINGZHI HOU IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT**

I, Bingzhi Hou, 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 General Manager for Plaintiff SHENZHEN DAISILI COMMERCIAL CO., LTD. ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration on matter within my own personal knowledge unless stated otherwise. Plaintiff is the owner of the following copyright registration: VA0002407256 (the "Copyright Protected Image").

4. Plaintiff licenses the Copyright Protected 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 Copyright Protected 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 copyright asserted in this action: VA0002407256. (the “Copyright Protected Image”).

6. It is without question that the Defaulting Defendant has engaged in the intentional misappropriation and unauthorized use of the Copyright Protected Image. In this regard, Plaintiff’s Copyright Protected Photograph, 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 Copyright Protected Image for soliciting their competing product sales without obtaining a license and have never been authorized to use the Copyright Protected Photograph.

9. 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.

10. The Defaulting Defendant named in the company’s copyright infringement enforcement actions is engaged in the practice of copying Plaintiff’s copyright protected photograph and then associating this image 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 copyright protected image, without authorization, or such

unauthorized image is 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 image 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 March 30th, 2026, in Shenzhen City, Guangdong Province of the People's Republic of China.

By: /s/ Bingzhi Hou  
BINGZHI HOU

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the March 30, 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 <https://blointernetenforcement.com/>, and distributed to ecommerce platform, Temu.

By: /s/ Katherine M. Kuhn  
Katherine M. Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)  
**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**  
233 S. Wacker Drive, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor, #57  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (702) 462-5973 | Fax: (702) 553-3404  
Katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

<b>Defendant Name</b>	<b>Defendant Email Address</b>
wangqiao dba Look at Joes clothes	361622201@qq.com