

1 John H. Platt (#019950)
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
2 One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren
3 Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
Telephone: 602-382-6334
4 Facsimile: (602) 382-6070
E-mail: jhplatt@swlaw.com
5 Attorney for Plaintiff

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
8

9 Dependable Staffing Services, L.L.C., an
Arizona limited liability company,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Dependable Staffing Services, Inc., a
13 California corporation;

14 Kelley Smith, an individual;

15 Nursing Registry Consultants
16 Corporation, an Arizona corporation
d/b/a NursingCorp; and

17 Joseph Caracci, an individual,

18 Defendants.
19

No.

COMPLAINT

(FEDERAL TRADEMARK
INFRINGEMENT, UNFAIR
COMPETITION, CYBERPIRACY)

(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)

20 Plaintiff Dependable Staffing Services, L.L.C. (“Plaintiff”), for its Complaint
21 against defendants Dependable Staffing Services, Inc. (“DSSI”), Kelley Smith (“Smith”),
22 Nursing Registry Consultants Corporation (“NursingCorp”) and Joseph Caracci
23 (“Caracci”) (sometimes referred to collectively herein as “Defendants”), alleges as
24 follows:

25 **PARTIES AND JURISDICTION**

26 1. Plaintiff is an Arizona limited liability company having a principal place of
27 business in Phoenix, Arizona.

28 2. Upon information and belief, defendant Dependable Staffing Services, Inc.

1 is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Newport Beach,
2 California.

3 3. Upon information and belief, defendant Kelley Smith is a resident of
4 California.

5 4. Upon information and belief, defendant Nursing Registry Consultants
6 Corporation is an Arizona corporation with its principal place of business in Chandler,
7 Arizona.

8 5. Upon information and belief, defendant Joseph Caracci is a resident of
9 Arizona.

10 6. This is an action to recover damages and for injunctive relief arising under
11 the trademark laws of the United States and the related laws of the State of Arizona, with
12 this Court having jurisdiction of the subject matter for each of the following claims:

13 a. Trademark infringement in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.
14 § 1114(1), with jurisdiction vested in this Court by virtue of 15 U.S.C. § 1121, 28 U.S.C.
15 § 1331, and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a).

16 b. Unfair competition in violation of § 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15
17 U.S.C. § 1125(a), with jurisdiction vested in this Court by virtue of 15 U.S.C. § 1121, 28
18 U.S.C. § 1331, and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a).

19 c. Violation of the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act, §
20 43(d) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d), with jurisdiction vested in this Court by
21 virtue of 15 U.S.C. § 1121, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a).

22 d. Common law trademark infringement, with supplemental
23 jurisdiction vested in this Court by 28 U.S.C. § 1338(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

24 e. Common law unfair competition, with supplemental jurisdiction
25 vested in this Court by 28 U.S.C. § 1338(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

26 7. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants by virtue of their
27 conduct and business activities in Arizona, as well as their intentional actions expressly
28 aimed at Plaintiff in Arizona, which Defendants know to cause harm to Plaintiff in

1 Arizona. Plaintiff's claims herein arise out of or are related to that conduct and those
2 actions, and the exercise of personal jurisdiction over Defendants by this court is
3 reasonable.

4 8. Venue is proper in the District of Arizona pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
5 § 1391(b)(2), because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to
6 Plaintiff's claims occurred in this District.

7 **NATURE OF THE DISPUTE**

8 9. The individual Defendants and the respective corporate Defendants, which
9 upon information and belief are owned, operated, and/or controlled by the individual
10 Defendants, are infringing the valuable trademark rights of Plaintiff. Defendants are
11 cyberpirates who have registered and are using Internet domain names that infringe
12 Plaintiff's federally-registered DEPENDABLE STAFFING trademark. By this action,
13 Plaintiff seeks (1) to enjoin Defendants' wrongful and infringing conduct, which is
14 causing irreparable harm to Plaintiff; (2) transfer of ownership of the domain names to
15 Plaintiff; and (3) to collect damages resulting from Defendants' willful and intentional
16 conduct.

17 **BACKGROUND**

18 10. Dependable Staffing Services, L.L.C. was established in 1996. It is an
19 Arizona corporation which provides staffing services for hospitals and clinics throughout
20 the United States. Dependable Staffing Services recruits nurses and other health care
21 professionals and fulfills employment and staffing requests for such health care
22 professionals from various hospitals and clinics across the country.

23 11. Applications for employment by health care professionals and requests for
24 staffing by hospitals are coordinated through Dependable Staffing Services' website
25 <<http://www.dependablestaffing.com>>. The site features a secure, online application that
26 can be accessed and completed over the Internet. This allows Dependable Staffing
27 Services to meet the needs of clientele across the country from its headquarters in
28 Phoenix, Arizona.

1 12. Dependable Staffing Services, L.L.C. filed for federal registration of the
2 mark DEPENDABLE STAFFING on January 10, 2005. The mark was registered on
3 September 16, 2006, as U.S. Service Mark Registration No. 3,141,276 for use in
4 connection with “employment hiring, recruiting, placement, staffing and career
5 networking services.” The mark has been in use continuously in commerce since at least
6 as early as May 1, 1996.

7 13. Plaintiff recently became aware that Defendants DSSI and Smith were
8 using the company name “Dependable Staffing Services” and engaging in online
9 advertising of employment services for health care professionals and staffing services for
10 hospitals and clinics.

11 14. Plaintiff became aware that Defendants DSSI and Smith registered and
12 established a commercial website accessible via the domain name
13 <dependablestaffingservices.net> (“the First Infringing Domain Name”).

14 15. Defendant Smith is listed as the registrant of the First Infringing Domain
15 Name, as shown in Exhibit A.

16 16. The website accessible via the First Infringing Domain Name featured the
17 company name “Dependable Staffing Services,” and advertised medical professional
18 staffing services. The site also featured a web-based employment application similar to
19 the application on Plaintiff’s website.

20 17. On July 11th, 2008, Plaintiff sent a cease and desist letter to Defendants
21 DSSI and Smith. The letter explained that DEPENDABLE STAFFING was Plaintiff’s
22 federally-registered trademark, and that the unauthorized use of the company designation
23 “Dependable Staffing Services” constituted trademark infringement. Plaintiff also gave
24 Defendants DSSI and Smith notice that the First Infringing Domain Name infringed the
25 DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark and violated the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer
26 Protection Act. The letter further gave notice to Defendants that if they did not cease
27 their infringing use of the DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark, Plaintiff would file suit to
28 enforce its intellectual property rights.

1 18. After receiving Plaintiff’s cease and desist letter, Defendant advised
2 Plaintiff’s counsel there was some business relationship between Defendants DSSI and
3 Smith and Defendants NursingCorp and Caracci.

4 19. Upon information and belief, Defendants NursingCorp and Caracci are
5 parties to a business relationship with Defendants DSSI and Smith, whereby NursingCorp
6 and Caracci have assisted and continue to assist Defendants DSSI and Smith in the
7 organization and operation of a medical professional staffing company.

8 20. Upon information and belief Defendants DSSI and Smith stopped using
9 the website at the First Infringing Domain Name and re-established their website
10 accessible via the domain name <dependablestaffingservice.net> (“the Second Infringing
11 Domain Name”). The First Infringing Domain Name and the Second Infringing Domain
12 Name are collectively referred to as “the Infringing Domain Names”.

13 21. Defendant Caracci is listed as the registrant of the Second Infringing
14 Domain Name, as shown in Exhibit B.

15 22. The content of the Second Infringing Domain Name is substantially the
16 same as that of the First Infringing Domain Name.

17 23. Defendants continue to use the DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark in
18 commerce, both as a company name and in the context of the Second Infringing Domain
19 Name.

20 24. As a result of Defendants’ failure to terminate the infringing uses of the
21 DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark, Plaintiff filed this action for relief.

22 **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

23 **COUNT ONE**

24 **TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE LANHAM ACT, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)**

25 18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding allegations of this
26 Complaint.

27 19. Defendants’ use in commerce, without consent, of a confusingly similar
28 reproduction of Plaintiff’s federally-registered DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark, and

1 Defendants’ applying such reproduction to the pages of the Infringing Domain Names
2 websites, in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or advertising of Defendants’
3 services is likely to cause confusion or to deceive the consuming public.

4 20. Defendants’ actions violate 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1). As a direct consequence
5 of Defendants’ actions, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount at this time not totally
6 ascertainable, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury to the goodwill of Plaintiff’s
7 federally-registered mark, its rights, and its business, unless and until the Defendants are
8 restrained from continuing their wrongful acts.

9 COUNT TWO

10 UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER § 43(a) OF THE LANHAM ACT, 15 U.S.C. §
11 1125(a)

12 21. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding allegations of this
13 Complaint.

14 22. Defendants’ registration and use of the Infringing Domain Names and
15 designations that are identical and/or confusingly similar to Plaintiff’s mark without
16 Plaintiff’s consent is likely to cause confusion or mistake or have deceived customers as
17 to an affiliation, connection, or association between Defendants’ “Dependable Staffing
18 Services” and Plaintiff’s “Dependable Staffing Services, LLC” trade name and federally-
19 registered DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark.

20 23. Defendants have engaged in this false designation of origin and false
21 description and representation of its products and services in interstate commerce in an
22 effort to willfully, maliciously, intentionally, and unfairly compete with Plaintiff and
23 Plaintiff’s DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark and such actions constitute unfair
24 competition.

1 COUNT THREE

2 FEDERAL CYBERPIRACY; VIOLATION OF § 43(d) OF THE LANHAM ACT, THE
3 ANTI-CYBERSQUATING PROTECTION ACT, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)

4 24. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding allegations of this
5 Complaint.

6 25. Defendants' registration and use of the Infringing Domain Names and
7 designations that are identical and/or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's DEPENDABLE
8 STAFFING mark without Plaintiff's permission is likely to cause confusion, mistake and
9 deception as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of Defendants' services and to dilute
10 the distinctive quality of Plaintiff's DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark in violation of
11 Section 43(d) of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)).

12 26. Plaintiff's DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark was distinctive at the time
13 Defendants registered the Infringing Domain Names.

14 27. Defendants' actions violate 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d). As a direct consequence
15 of Defendants' acts, Plaintiff has been damaged in an amount at this time not totally
16 ascertainable, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury to the goodwill of Plaintiff's
17 DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark, its rights, and its business, unless and until the
18 Defendants are restrained from continuing their wrongful acts.

19 COUNT FOUR

20 TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT AND UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER
21 ARIZONA COMMON LAW

22 28. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding allegations of this
23 Complaint.

24 29. As set forth more fully above, Plaintiff's DEPENDABLE STAFFING
25 mark is indicative of origin, relationship, and association with Plaintiff.

26 30. Plaintiff's DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark is widely recognized in the
27 industry and by the public as indicating the source of Plaintiff's services.

28 31. Defendants began use of the DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark subsequent

1 to Plaintiff's use of the DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark.

2 32. Defendants' use of the DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark in connection
3 with their services creates a likelihood of confusion or deception of the consuming public
4 as to the source of the services provided by Defendants, and creates a false impression of
5 an affiliation or endorsement by or other connection with Defendants.

6 33. Defendants' actions described above violate Plaintiff's common law
7 trademark rights and constitute trademark infringement and unfair competition.

8 34. Defendants committed these acts of trademark infringement and unfair
9 competition fraudulently and maliciously and in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights,
10 with intent to injure Plaintiff.

11 35. As a direct and proximate consequence of Defendants' actions, Plaintiff
12 has suffered irreparable injury. Such harm will continue and increase unless Defendants
13 are preliminarily and permanently enjoined from their unlawful conduct.

14 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands a trial by jury and judgment in favor of Plaintiff
16 against Defendants for the following:

17 I. A preliminary and permanent injunction restraining Defendants, their
18 agents, servants, employees, attorneys and those persons in active concert or participation
19 with them:

20 A. From using Plaintiff's DEPENDABLE STAFFING mark, the
21 Infringing Domain Names, or any mark, name, or domain name similar
22 thereto in connection with any authorized goods or services in the United
23 States;

24 B. From using any logo, trade name, service mark or trademark which
25 may be calculated to falsely represent or which has the effect of falsely
26 representing that the services and/or products of Defendants are sponsored
27 by, authorized by, or in any way associated with Plaintiff;

28 C. From otherwise unfairly competing with Plaintiff;

