

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

Michael Barcohana,

Plaintiff,

v.

Changsha Leyoung and Puffbody,

Defendants.

**Case No. 1:26-cv-01372-SLE-GAF**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis**

**Magistrate Gabriel A. Fuentes**

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Plaintiff hereby moves this Honorable Court for entry of a Preliminary Injunction (the “Motion”). The scope of the requested Preliminary Injunction is substantially identical to the Temporary Restraining Order (the “TRO”) granted on March 10, 2026 [Dkt. No. 18]. Plaintiff’s Motion, for which notice will be provided, is properly submitted to the Court on a non-*ex parte* basis. A Memorandum of Law in support and Declaration of Joseph W. Droter is filed concurrently with this Motion.

DATED: March 19, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter

Joseph W. Droter (Bar No. 6329630)

Katherine Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)

**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**

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

Chicago IL 60606

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

katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com

joseph@bayramoglu-legal.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 19th day of March 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, Amazon.

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

<b>Store Name</b>	<b>Store ID</b>	<b>Email</b>
Changsha Leyoung	A20ETYNZXJOFRN	magdalena-malinowska@outlook.com
Puffbody	A35FLXFOR45NNO	jifengxiaoma@gmail.com

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

Michael Barcohana,

Plaintiff,

v.

Changsha Leyoung and Puffbody,

Defendants.

**Case No. 1:26-cv-01372-SLE-GAF**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis**

**Magistrate Gabriel A. Fuentes**

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF’S  
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Plaintiff Michael Barcohana (“Plaintiff”) submits this Memorandum of Law in support of its Motion for Preliminary Injunction (the “Motion”).

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff initiated this action against the Defendants, Changsha Leyoung and Puffbody, (the “Defendants”), for infringement of United States Trademark Registration No. 7824763, (the “Trademark”). As alleged in Plaintiff’s Complaint [Dkt. No. 1], Defendants are knowingly and willfully offering for sale, selling, and/or importing into the United States, through the unauthorized use of the Trademark on their Online Stores, counterfeit inferior products.

**a. Procedural History**

On March 10, 2026, this Court granted Plaintiff’s Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”) and Service by Publication, Electronic Service, and Expedited Discovery request on an *ex parte* basis [Dkt. Nos. 17 and 18]. Substantively, the TRO [Dkt. No. 18] authorized and directed Plaintiff to provide notice of these proceedings, and the TRO required Plaintiff to provide notice of any preliminary injunction hearing to Defendants by electronically publishing a link to the Complaint,

this Order, and other relevant documents on a website and by sending an e-mail to the e-mail addresses provided by Plaintiff and provided for Defendants by third parties with the service documents attached in PDF format. [Dkt No. 18 ¶ 7-8.] Amazon provided Defendants' verified email addresses: magdalena-malinowska@outlook.com and jifengxiaoma@gmail.com; so that electronic service of process authorized under the TRO could be effectuated (Droter ¶ 5). On March 19, 2026, Plaintiff effectuated electronic service of process on Defendants [Dkt. No. 22] (*Id.* ¶ 6).

Based on the foregoing procedural history, including having effectuated electronic service on Defendants as required by the TRO, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court now enter a Preliminary Injunction in this matter. Substantively, as stated earlier, and as argued below, Plaintiff's request for issuance of a preliminary injunction is in full compliance with the applicable standards for granting such relief.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. **This Court has already found that the requirements for a preliminary injunction have been met.**

Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court convert the TRO to a preliminary injunction to prevent further illegal conduct by Defendants. To date, Plaintiff has presented virtually identical grounds for the issuance of preliminary injunctive relief addressing allegations of Internet-based counterfeiting, and such relief has been granted, by the court in this judicial district. See, *e.g.*, *Michael Barcohana v. ZENARAA*, Case No. 25-cv-13727, Dkt. No. 30 (Ellis, J.); *Michael Barcohana v. The Individuals*, Case No. 1:25-cv-10740, Dkt. No. 34 (Kocaras, J.) Plaintiff submits that these prior decisions demonstrate the merits of Plaintiff's current request for issuance of preliminary injunctive relief by this Court. Accordingly, Plaintiff asserts that the Court should grant the Motion and enter a Preliminary Injunction against the Defendants. Further, Plaintiff

asserts that no circumstances have changed since Plaintiff had previously requested relief in the form of a Temporary Restraining Order. As such, Plaintiff is unaware of any new information that would affect the Court's original analysis.

Since the standard for granting a TRO and the standard for granting a preliminary injunction are identical in this Circuit, the requirements for entry of a preliminary injunction extending the TRO have been satisfied. See, e.g. *Charter Nat'l Bank & Trust v. Charter One Fin., Inc.*, No. 1:01-cv-00905, 2001 WL 527404, \*1 (N.D. Ill. May 15, 2001) (citations omitted). To be entitled to preliminary injunctive relief, the moving party must first show that it has (1) there is a reasonable likelihood that Plaintiff will succeed on the merits; (2) Plaintiff will suffer irreparable injury if the order is not granted because there is no adequate remedy at law; (3) the balance of hardships tips in Plaintiff's favor; and (4) the public interest will not be disserved by the injunction. *Columbia Pictures Indus., Inc. v. Jasso*, 927 F. Supp. 1075, 1076 (N.D. Ill. 1996). As this Court has already entered a TRO on March 10, 2026, it has already found that the above requirements have been satisfied.

If these threshold requirements are met by the moving party, the court then "exercise[s] its discretion whether the balance of the harms weighs in favor of the moving party or whether the nonmoving party or the public interest will be harmed sufficiently such that the injunction should be denied." *Christian Legal Soc'y v. Walker*, 453 F.3d 853, 859 (7th Cir. 2006). "This process involves engaging in what we term the sliding scale approach; the more likely the [moving party] will succeed on the merits, the less the balance of irreparable harms need favor the [moving party's] position." *Ty, Inc. v. Jones Group, Inc.*, 237 F.3d 891, 895 (7th Cir. 2001). The sliding scale approach is not mathematical in nature, rather "it is more properly characterized as subjective and intuitive, one which permits district courts to weigh the competing considerations and mold

appropriate relief.” Id. at 895-896. The greater the movant's likelihood of succeeding on the merits, the less the balancing of harms need be in his favor. *See Eli Lilly & Co. v. Natural Answers, Inc.*, 233 F.3d 456, 461 (7th Cir. 2000).

As established by the evidence in Exhibit 2 to the Complaint [Dkt. Nos. 1-2 and 2-2], Plaintiff's Motion for TRO [Dkt No. 14], and by this Court's entry of the TRO [Dkt. No. 18], the above requirements for entry of a preliminary injunction have been satisfied. The record establishes that through Defendants' illegal operations, Defendants have infringed upon Plaintiff's Federally Registered Trademark. Thus, plaintiff is entitled to preliminary injunctive relief.

**B. The Current Bond is Sufficient to Protect Defendants' Interests**

The Court has previously required Plaintiff to post a bond in the sum of \$10,000.00 in connection with issuance of the TRO [Dkt. No. 18 ¶ 11 and Dkt. No. 21] The exact same circumstances, if not more, supporting the Court's determination of this bond amount apply to Plaintiff's request for entry of a Preliminary Injunction. Such a strong showing militates against a subsequent finding that injunctive relief was improperly granted. Accordingly, Plaintiff requests the Court maintain the current bond amount required for issuance of the TRO for issuance of the preliminary injunction.

**III. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court enter a Preliminary Injunction as requested above. If required, a minute order setting a deadline for Defendants to oppose the Motion and set a hearing on same can be issued, which Plaintiff will immediately serve Defendants with the Minute Order if issued by the Court. Plaintiff additionally respectfully requests the Court maintain the current bond amount required under the TRO, together with issuing any other relief that it deems just and proper.

DATED: March 19, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter

Joseph W. Droter (Bar No. 6329630)

Katherine Kuhn (Bar No. 6331405)

**BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC**

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

Chicago IL 60606

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

katherine@bayramoglu-legal.com

joseph@bayramoglu-legal.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 19th day of March 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, Amazon.

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

<b>Store Name</b>	<b>Store ID</b>	<b>Email</b>
Changsha Leyoung	A20ETYNZXJOFRN	magdalena-malinowska@outlook.com
Puffbody	A35FLXFOR45NNO	jifengxiaoma@gmail.com

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

Michael Barcohana,

Plaintiff,

v.

Changsha Leyoung and Puffbody,

Defendants.

**Case No. 1:26-cv-01372-SLE-GAF**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis**

**Magistrate Gabriel A. Fuentes**

**DECLARATION OF JOSEPH W. DROTER, ESQ.**  
**IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

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 Preliminary Injunction (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 Michael Barcohana ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration from my matters within my own personal knowledge unless stated otherwise.

4. On March 10, 2026, this Court granted Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO"), Service by Publication, Electronic Service, and Expedited Discovery request on an *ex parte* basis [Dkt Nos. 17 and 18].

5. Amazon provided Defendants' verified email addresses: magdalena-malinowska@outlook.com and jifengxiaoma@gmail.com; so that electronic service of process authorized under the TRO could be effectuated.

6. On March 19, 2026, Plaintiff effectuated electronic service of process on Defendants [Dkt. No. 22].

7. Genuine and authentic copies of the unpublished decisions cited in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction are attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**.

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

Executed on March 19, 2026, in Chicago, Illinois.

By: /s/ Joseph W. Droter  
JOSEPH W. DROTER, ESQ.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 19th day of March 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, Amazon.

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

Store Name	Store ID	Email
Changsha Leyoung	A20ETYNZXJOFRN	magdalena-malinowska@outlook.com
Puffbody	A35FLXFOR45NNO	jifengxiaoma@gmail.com

# **EXHIBIT 1**

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

MICHAEL BARCOHANA,

Plaintiff,

v.

ZENARAA,

Defendant.

**Case No. 1:25-cv-13727**

**Honorable Sara L. Ellis**

**Magistrate Maria Valdez**

**PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION ORDER**

Plaintiff MICHAEL BARCOHANA (“Plaintiff”) filed a Motion for Entry of a Preliminary Injunction against the Defendant, ZENARAA, (“Defendant”) and using at least the domain names identified in the Complaint and the online marketplace account zenaraa.com (the “Online Marketplace”). After reviewing the Motion and the accompanying record, this Court GRANTS Plaintiff’s Motion in part as follows.

This Court finds Plaintiff has provided notice to Defendant in accordance with the Temporary Restraining Order entered November 25, 2025, [DOCKET NO. 19] (“TRO”), and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(a)(1).

This Court also finds, in the absence of adversarial presentation, that it has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant directly targets its business activities toward consumers in the United States, including Illinois. Specifically, Plaintiff has provided a basis to conclude that Defendant has targeted sales to Illinois residents by setting up and operating e-commerce stores that target United States consumers using one or more seller aliases, offers shipping to the United States, including to the State of Illinois, and has sold knockoff products through the unauthorized use and display of Plaintiff’s federally registered QUEEN TAPE

Trademark (the “Plaintiff’s Trademark”) to residents of the State of Illinois. *See* Docket No. 1-1, Ex. 1 to the Complaint, which includes Plaintiff’s Trademark, Reg. No. 7824763. In this case, Plaintiff has presented evidence that Defendant’s e-commerce store is reaching out to do business with Illinois residents by operating one or more commercial, interactive internet stores through which Illinois residents can and do purchase products using unauthorized use and display of Plaintiff’s Trademark. *See* Docket No. 15, which includes evidence confirming that each Defendant e-commerce store does stand ready, willing and able to ship its counterfeit goods to customers in Illinois using the unauthorized use and display of Plaintiff’s Trademark.

This Court also finds that the injunctive relief previously granted in the TRO should remain in place through the pendency of this litigation, and that issuing this Preliminary Injunction is warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65. Evidence submitted in support of this Motion and in support of Plaintiff’s previously granted Motion for Entry of a TRO establishes that Plaintiff has demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits; that no remedy at law exists; and that Plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted.

Specifically, Plaintiff has proved a prima facie case of trademark infringement because (1) Plaintiff is the lawful assignee of all right, title and interest in and to the federally registered Trademark, (2) Defendant makes, uses, offers for sale, sells, and/or imports into the United States for subsequent sale or uses knock-off products that infringes directly and/or indirectly Plaintiff’s Trademark, and (3) an ordinary observer would be deceived into thinking the Infringing Products were the same as Plaintiff’s Trademark. Furthermore, Defendant’s continued, and unauthorized use of Plaintiff’s Trademark irreparably harms Plaintiff through loss of customers’ goodwill and reputational harm. Monetary damages fail to address such

damage and, therefore, Plaintiff has an inadequate remedy at law. Moreover, the public interest is served by entry of this Preliminary Injunction to dispel the public confusion created by Defendant's actions. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

1. Defendant, its officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons acting for, with, by, through, under, or in active concert with it be preliminarily enjoined and restrained from:
  - a. Using or displaying the Plaintiff's Trademark, in any medium, whether it be print, digital or otherwise, in connection with the distribution, marketing, advertising, offering for sale, or sale of any product that is not a genuine Plaintiff product or is not authorized by Plaintiff to be sold in connection with the Plaintiff's Trademark;
  - b. passing off, inducing, or enabling others to sell or pass off any product as a genuine Plaintiff's product or any other product produced by Plaintiff through the use or display of the Plaintiff's Trademark;
  - c. committing any acts calculated to cause consumers to believe that Defendant's products are those sold under the authorization, control, or supervision of Plaintiff, or are sponsored by, approved by, or otherwise connected with Plaintiff; and
  - d. manufacturing, shipping, delivering, holding for sale, transferring or otherwise moving, storing, distributing, returning, or otherwise disposing of, in any manner, products or inventory not manufactured by or for Plaintiff, nor authorized by Plaintiff to be sold or offered for sale through the use or display of the Plaintiff's Trademark.
2. Defendant shall not transfer or dispose of any money or other of Defendant's assets in any of Defendant's financial accounts.


3. The domain name registries for the Defendant Domain Names, including, but not limited to, VeriSign, Inc., Neustar, Inc., Afilias Limited, CentralNic, Nominet, and the Public Interest Registry, and the domain name registrars, including, but not limited to, GoDaddy Operating Company LLC, Name.com, PDR LTD. d/b/a/ PublicDomainRegistry.com, and Namecheap Inc., within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of this Order or prior to the expiration of this Order, whichever date shall occur first, shall disable the Defendant Domain Names and make them inactive and untransferable until further ordered by this Court.
4. Upon Plaintiff's request, Defendant and any third party with actual notice of this Order who is providing services to Defendant, or in connection with any of Defendant's Online Marketplaces, including, without limitation, any online marketplace platforms such as eBay, Inc., AliExpress, Alibaba Group Holding Ltd. ("Alibaba"), Amazon.com, Inc., ContextLogic Inc. d/b/a Wish.com ("Wish.com"), and Dhgate (collectively, the "Third Party Providers"), shall, within seven (7) calendar days after receipt of such notice, provide to Plaintiff expedited discovery, limited to copies of documents and records in such person's or entity's possession or control sufficient to determine:
  - a. the identities and locations of Defendant, their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any persons acting in active concert or participation with it, including all known contact information and all associated e-mail addresses;
  - b. the nature of Defendant's operations and all associated sales, methods of payment for services, and financial information, including, without limitation, identifying information associated with the Online Marketplaces and Defendant's financial

accounts, including Defendant's sales and listing history related to their respective Online Marketplaces; and

- c. any financial accounts owned or controlled by Defendant, including its officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any persons acting in active concert or participation with it, including such accounts residing with or under the control of any banks, savings and loan associations, payment processors or other financial institutions, including, without limitation, PayPal, Inc. ("PayPal"), Alipay, Wish.com, Alibaba, Ant Financial Services Group ("Ant Financial"), Amazon Pay, or other merchant account providers, payment providers, third party processors, and credit card associations (e.g., MasterCard and VISA).
5. Upon Plaintiff's request, those with notice of this Order, including the Third Party Providers as defined in Paragraph 4, shall within seven (7) calendar days after receipt of such notice, disable and cease displaying any advertisements used by or associated with Defendant in connection with the sale of counterfeit and infringing goods using the Plaintiff's Trademark.
6. Any Third Party Providers, including PayPal, Alipay, Alibaba, Ant Financial, Wish.com, and Amazon Pay, shall, within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of this Order:
  - a. locate all accounts and funds connected to Defendant's seller aliases, including, but not limited to, any financial accounts connected to Defendant and any e-mail addresses provided for Defendant by third parties; and
  - b. restrain and enjoin any such accounts or funds from transferring or disposing of any money or other of Defendant's assets until further ordered by this Court.

7. Plaintiff may provide notice of the proceedings in this case to Defendant, including service of process pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3), and any future motions, by electronically publishing a link to the Pleadings, this Order, and other relevant documents on a website and by sending an e-mail with a link to said website to the e-mail address [contact@zenaraa.com](mailto:contact@zenaraa.com) and any email addresses provided for Defendant by third parties. The Clerk of the Court is directed to issue a single original summons in the name of “ZENARAA” that shall apply to Defendant. The combination of providing notice via electronic publication and e-mail, along with any notice that Defendant receive from payment processors, shall constitute notice reasonably calculated under all circumstances to apprise Defendant of the pendency of the action and afford them the opportunity to present their objections.
8. Plaintiff’s Complaint [DOCKET NO. 2], Exhibits [1]-[2] thereto [DOCKET NO. 2-1, 2-2], Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of J. Droter [DOCKET NO. 5, 15], are unsealed.
9. Defendant may appear and move to dissolve or modify the Order as permitted by and in compliance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Northern District of Illinois Local Rules.
10. Any third party impacted by this Order may move for appropriate relief.
11. The \$10,000 bond posted by Plaintiff shall remain with the Court until a final disposition of this case or until this Preliminary Injunction is terminated.

SO ORDERED:



---

Sara L. Ellis  
United States District Judge

Dated: December 18, 2025

ZENARAA  
[contact@zenaraa.com](mailto:contact@zenaraa.com)

Website URL:  
<https://zenaraa.com/>

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

Michael Barcohana,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE INDIVIDUALS, CORPORATIONS,  
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES,  
PARTNERSHIPS AND  
UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS  
IDENTIFIED IN SCHEDULE "A" HERETO,

Defendants.

**Case No. 1:25-cv-10740-CPK-MDW**

**Honorable Charles P. Kocoras**

**Magistrate M. David Weisman**

**ORDER FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

THIS CAUSE being before the Court on Plaintiff, Michael Barcohana, initially identified as John Doe, ("Plaintiff") Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction ("Motion") and this Court having heard the evidence before it, hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of a Preliminary Injunction in its entirety against Defendants, The Individuals, Corporations, Limited Liability Companies, Partnerships and Unincorporated Associations Identified in Schedule A, which operate a fully interactive, e-commerce stores on TikTok Shop (collectively, the "Seller Aliases").

The Court finds, in the absence of adversarial presentation, that it has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants directly target their business activities toward consumers in the United States, including consumers in the State of Illinois. Specifically, PLAINTIFF has provided a basis to conclude that Defendants have targeted sales to Illinois residents by setting up and operating e-commerce stores that target United States consumers using one or more seller aliases, offer shipping to the United States, including to the State of

Illinois, and has sold competing products through the unauthorized use and display of Plaintiff's Trademark (the "Plaintiff's Trademark") to residents of the State of Illinois. Docket No. 1-1, Ex. 1 to the Complaint, which includes Plaintiff's United States Trademark Registration Number 7824763 ("the QUEEN TAPE Mark"),

THIS COURT FURTHER FINDS that injunctive relief previously granted in the Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO") should remain in place through the pendency of this litigation and that issuing this Preliminary Injunction is warranted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65. Evidence submitted in support of this Motion and in support of Plaintiff's previously granted Motion for Entry of a Temporary Restraining Order establishes that Plaintiff has demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits; that no remedy at law exists; and that Plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted. Specifically, Plaintiff has proved a prima facie case of copyright infringement because (1) Plaintiff is the lawful assignee of all right, title and interest in and to the federally registered trademark (2) Defendants make, use, offers for sale, sells, and/or imports into the United States for subsequent sale or uses counterfeit products that infringe directly and/or indirectly, through the unauthorized use of Plaintiff's federally registered trademarks and (3) an ordinary observer would be deceived into thinking the Counterfeit Products were the same as Plaintiff's federally registered trademark.

Furthermore, Defendants' continued, unauthorized use of Plaintiff's federally registered trademark irreparably harms Plaintiff through loss of customers' goodwill and reputational harm. Monetary damages fail to address such damage and, therefore, Plaintiff has an inadequate remedy at law. Moreover, the public interest is served by entry of this Preliminary Injunction to dispel the public confusion created by Defendants' actions. As such, this Court orders that:

1. Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons acting for, with, by, through, under, or in active concert with them be temporarily enjoined and restrained from:

- a. Using or displaying the Plaintiff's Trademark, in any medium, whether it be print, digital or otherwise, in connection with the distribution, marketing, advertising, offering for sale, or sale of any product that is not a genuine Plaintiff's product or is not authorized by PLAINTIFF to be sold in connection with the Plaintiff's Trademark;
- b. passing off, inducing, or enabling others to sell or pass off any product as a genuine Plaintiff's product or any other product produced by PLAINTIFF through the use or display of the Plaintiff's Trademark;
- c. committing any acts calculated to cause consumers to believe that Defendants' products are those sold under the authorization, control, or supervision of PLAINTIFF, or are sponsored by, approved by, or otherwise connected with PLAINTIFF;
- d. manufacturing, shipping, delivering, holding for sale, transferring or otherwise moving, storing, distributing, returning, or otherwise disposing of, in any manner, products or inventory not manufactured by or for PLAINTIFF, nor authorized by PLAINTIFF to be sold or offered for sale through the use or display of the Plaintiff's Trademark; and
- e. Defendants shall not transfer or dispose of any money or other of Defendants' assets in any of Defendants' financial accounts.

2. Upon PLAINTIFF's request, those with notice of this Order, including any third party with actual notice of this Order who is providing services for any of the Defendants, or in connection with any of Defendants' Online Marketplaces, including, without limitation, any online marketplace platforms such as Walmart Temu, eBay Inc., AliExpress, Alibaba, Amazon.com Inc., Wish.com, Dhgate and TikTok (collectively the "Third Party Providers"), shall within seven (7) calendar days after receipt of such notice, disable and cease displaying any advertisements used by or associated with Defendants in connection with the sale of counterfeit and infringing goods using the Plaintiff's Trademark.

3. Any Third-Party Providers, including PayPal, Alipay, Alibaba, Ant Financial, Wish.com, Amazon Pay and TikTok Inc., shall, within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of this Order:

- a. locate all accounts and funds connected to Defendants' seller aliases, including, but not limited to, any financial accounts connected to the information listed in Schedule A hereto, and any e-mail addresses provided for Defendants by third parties; and
- b. restrain and enjoin any such accounts or funds from transferring or disposing of any money or other of Defendants' assets until further order by this Court.

4. Upon PLAINTIFF's request, those with notice of this Order, including the Third-Party Providers as defined in Paragraph 2, shall within ten (10) business days after receipt of such notice, disable and cease displaying any advertisements used by or associated with Defendants in connection with the sale of counterfeit and infringing goods using the Plaintiff's Trademark.

5. Defendants shall be restrained and enjoined from transferring or disposing of any

money or other assets of Defendant until further ordered by this Court.

6. Plaintiff is authorized to issue expedited written discovery, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 33, 34, 36, and 45 related to:

a. the identities and locations of Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any persons acting in active concert or participation with them, including all known contact information and all associated e-mail addresses;

b. the nature of Defendants' operations and all associated sales, methods of payment for services, and financial information, including, without limitation, identifying information associated with the Online Marketplaces and Defendant's financial accounts, including Defendant's sales and listing history related to their respective Online Marketplaces; and

c. any financial accounts owned or controlled by Defendant, including their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any persons acting in active concert or participation with them, including such accounts residing with or under the control of any banks, savings and loan associations, payment processors or other financial institutions, including, without limitation, Payoneer, Temu.com, PayPal Inc. ("PayPal"), Alipay, ContextLogic Inc. d/b/a Wish.com ("Wish.com"), Alibaba Group Holding Ltd. ("Alibaba"), Ant Financial Services Group ("Ant Financial"), Amazon Pay, or other merchant account providers, payment providers, third party processors, and credit card associations (e.g., MasterCard and VISA).


7. Plaintiff is authorized to issue any such expedited discovery requests via e-mail. Defendants shall respond to any such discovery requests within three (3) business days of being served via e-mail.

8. Plaintiff may provide notice of these proceedings to Defendants, including notice of the preliminary injunction hearing, service of process pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3), and any future motions by electronically publishing a link to the Complaint, this Order and other relevant documents on a website <https://blointernetenforcement.com/>, and by sending an e-mail to the e-mail addresses identified in Exhibits and any e-mail addresses provided for Defendants by third parties that includes a link to said website. The combination of providing notice via electronic publication and e-mail, along with any notice that Defendant receives from payment processors, shall constitute notice reasonably calculated under all circumstances to apprise Defendants of the pendency of the action and afford them the opportunity to present their objections.

9. Plaintiff has already deposited, to deposit with the Court five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00), as a surety bond, as security, which amount was determined adequate for the payment of such damages as any person may be entitled to recover as a result of wrongful restraint hereunder.

10. Defendants, that are subject to this Order may appear and move to dissolve or modify the Order as permitted by and in compliance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Northern District of Illinois Local Rules.

11. This Preliminary Injunction is entered on October 20, 2025 and shall remain in effect until Final Disposition of this case or until further order by the Court.

  
Honorable Judge Charles P. Kocoras  
United States District Judge