

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOVELTY TEXTILE, INC., a	)	Case No. CV 12-05602 DDP (MANx)
California corporation,	)	
	)	<b>ORDER DENYING MOTION TO</b>
Plaintiff,	)	<b>DISQUALIFY PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL</b>
	)	
v.	)	[Dkt. No. 18]
	)	
WINDSOR FASHIONS, INC., a	)	
California corporation;	)	
XTAREN, INC., a California	)	
corporation,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
_____	)	

Presently before the court is Defendant Xtaren, Inc. ("Xtaren")'s Motion to Disqualify Plaintiff's Counsel.

**I. BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff Novelty Textile, Inc. is "engaged in the apparel industry as a textile converter of imported and domestic fabrications." (Compl. ¶ 1.) Plaintiff creates and purchases exclusive rights to "unique two-dimensional graphic artworks" that

1 are primarily used on textiles and garments sold within the fashion  
2 industry. (Id.) Plaintiff alleges that Xtaren and Windsor  
3 Fashions, Inc. ("Windsor") (collectively "Defendants") sold,  
4 manufactured and/or distributed fabric and/or garments featuring a  
5 design identical or substantially similar to a design to which  
6 Plaintiff owns a registered copyright. (Id. at 4.)

7 Xtaren is a paying member of the Korean American Manufacturers  
8 Association ("KAMA").<sup>1</sup> (Chong Decl. ¶ 12, Exh. D.) On or about  
9 April 11, 2012, the Law Offices of Jeong sent a cease-and-desist  
10 letter<sup>2</sup> to Windsor on behalf of Plaintiff alleging copyright  
11 infringement for an apparel product Windsor once sold. (Kim Decl.  
12 ¶ 8.) Windsor's counsel, Manning & Kass, sent a letter to Xtaren  
13 demanding indemnification according to the terms of their purchase  
14 agreement. (Id. ¶ 5.) Attached to the indemnification letter was  
15 the cease-and-desist letter sent to Windsor by Jeong's office.  
16 (Id. ¶ 8.)

17 Dean Kim ("Kim") is Xtaren's general management assistant.  
18 (Id. ¶ 2.) Kim states that after receiving the letter from  
19 Windsor, he called several of the KAMA attorneys to discuss it.  
20 (Id. ¶ 7.) Kim made an appointment with Jeong, who was one of the  
21 KAMA attorneys, and prior to the meeting realized that Jeong's  
22 office had sent the cease-and-desist letter to Windsor. (Id. ¶ 8.)

---

23 <sup>1</sup> KAMA appears to be a "non-profit, member based service  
24 organization" which offers many services to its paying members,  
25 including "Free Legal Consulting Referral." (Motion to Disqualify  
26 ("Motion") 7; Chong Decl., Exh. C.) As discussed below, all of  
27 Xtaren's Exhibits regarding KAMA are inadmissible translations of  
the KAMA website into English using Google Translate. The court  
therefore does not rely on any of these translated Exhibits except  
as background.

28 <sup>2</sup> This letter was not provided to the court.

1  
2  
3 At that point, Kim consulted KAMA and Xtaren management and decided  
4 to go ahead with the meeting with Jeong, "since Jeon was KAMA's  
5 General Counsel and the consultation was free." (Id. ¶ 10.)  
6 Kim asserts that he met with Jeong and told him he was from  
7 Xtaren, but did not show him the cease-and-desist letter. (Id. ¶  
8 11.)

9 According to Kim:

10 [Kim] told Jeong the exact situation except for the  
11 actual product in dispute or the company Xtaren had to  
12 indemnify. Instead, [Kim] disclosed to Jeong exactly  
13 half of the number of units Xtaren sold and exactly half  
14 of the price it was sold for and simply stated to Jeong  
15 that Xtaren received a demand for indemnification from a  
16 retailer for an apparel product that Xtaren sold them.

17 [Kim] told Jeong that the apparel product that  
18 Xtaren sold to the retailer was manufactured by a Chinese  
19 company in China and was purchased by Xtaren for sale to  
20 third parties. Jeong advised [Kim] that the Chinese  
21 company who manufactured the apparel product may be  
22 jointly liable, but that it would be difficult for Xtaren  
23 to pursue litigation against a Chinese company because of  
24 jurisdiction issues and advised [Kim] that the best way  
25 to resolve this case was to reach settlement before  
26 Plaintiff filed suit.

1 (Id. ¶¶ 12-13.) Kim may or may not have told Jeong that he was  
2 from Xtaren. (Compare Kim Decl. ¶ 8 (“I told Jeong that I was from  
3 Xtaren but I did not show Jeong the actual cease and desist  
4 letter.”), with Kim Reply Decl. ¶ 9 (“When Jeong asked what company  
5 I was from, I told him I was from ‘Cal’s’ and he understood and  
6 wrote it down as ‘Kar’s’.”).)

7 Kim claims that Jeong advised him that the case could be  
8 settled for “somewhere between \$4,000 to \$6,000,” and that Jeong  
9 would charge \$2,000 in legal fees for a settlement, and more to  
10 represent Xtaren if it did not settle. (Id. ¶ 14.)

11 Jeong has no record of a meeting with Kim. (Jeong Decl. ¶ 5.)  
12 Xtaren claims that some handwritten notes from the meeting prove  
13 that it took place. (For the alleged notes, see Jeong Decl., Exh.  
14 1.) Jeong identified the handwriting as his own, but believes the  
15 content pertains to a different case involving Star Fabrics and LA  
16 Printex. (Id. ¶ 8.) Kim disagrees with that interpretation of the  
17 notes. (Kim Reply Decl., ¶¶ 6-10.)

## 18 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

19 “The trial court is vested with the power ‘[t]o control in  
20 furtherance of justice, the conduct of its ministerial officers.’”  
21 Henriksen v. Great Am. Sav. & Loan, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 184, 186 (Ct.  
22 App. 1992). The court’s inherent power includes the power to  
23 disqualify an attorney. Id. The court applies state law in  
24 determining matters of disqualification. In re Cnty. of L.A., 223  
25 F.3d 990, 995 (9th Cir. 2000).

26 The starting point for the court’s analysis is Rule 3-310(E)  
27 of the California Rules of Professional Conduct (“Avoiding the  
28

1  
2 Representation of Adverse Interests").<sup>3</sup> It provides, in relevant  
3 part, that "[a] member shall not, without the informed written  
4 consent of the client or former client, accept employment adverse  
5 to the client or former client where, by reason of the  
6 representation of the client or former client, the member has  
7 obtained confidential information material to the employment."

8  
9 In order to prevail on a motion to disqualify, the moving  
10 party and former client must demonstrate either: (1) that the  
11 former attorney actually possesses confidential information adverse  
12 to the former client; or (2) that there is a "'substantial  
13 relationship' between the former and current representation." H.F.  
14 Ahmanson & Co. v. Salomon Bros., Inc., 229 Cal. App. 3d 1445, 1452  
15 (Ct. App. 1991).

### 16 **III. DISCUSSION**

17 The threshold question is whether an attorney-client  
18 relationship was formed between Jeong and Xtaren. Without such a  
19 relationship, there is no basis on which to disqualify Jeong.  
20 Defendants offer two sources of an attorney-client relationship.  
21 First, they argue that because Xtaren is a paying member of KAMA,  
22 and because Jeong is one of several attorneys serving as general  
23 counsel for KAMA, Jeong had a "legal, business, financial,  
24 professional, or personal relationship" with Xtaren that would make  
25 him subject to the disclosure requirements of California Rules of

26 <sup>3</sup> The Central District of California has adopted the Rules  
27 of Professional Conduct of the State Bar of California, and the  
28 decisions construing them, as the governing standards of  
professional conduct. See C.D. Cal. L.R. 83-3.1.2.

1 Professional Conduct Rule 3-310(B)(1). Additionally, Defendants  
2 assert that the alleged meeting between Kim and Jeong created an  
3 attorney-client relationship and involved the transmission of  
4 confidential information to Jeong.

5 **A. Attorney-Client Relationship Based on KAMA Membership**

6 Defendants have provided evidence purporting to indicate the  
7 benefits that Xtaren derives from its KAMA membership. The court  
8 notes, first, that a translation by Google Translate is not  
9 sufficiently reliable to make it admissible. The pages of the KAMA  
10 website offered as Exhibits were translated by Google Translate.  
11 (Chong Decl. ¶ 6.) The translation's unreliability is clear on its  
12 face. Exhibit B to Chong's Declaration gives information on the  
13 nonsensical positions "Torture CPA" and "Torture customs," along  
14 with "General Counsel." The court therefore cannot rely on any of  
15 the translated website information in determining the services  
16 offered by KAMA and its membership benefits. Even assuming that  
17 KAMA does offer, as stated on the website translation, "Free Legal  
18 Consulting Referral" (Chong Decl., Exh. C), this is not sufficient  
19 to create a relationship that would "substantially affect [the  
20 attorney's] representation" of Novelty, absent an actual  
21 communication between a KAMA attorney and a KAMA member.

22 **B. Attorney-Client Relationship Based on Meeting**

23 The parties dispute whether the meeting between Kim and Jeong  
24 took place. The court finds that even assuming that a meeting took  
25 place, disqualifying Jeong in this situation would clear the way  
26 for one party to disqualify opposing counsel at will. Here, Kim  
27 knew that Jeong represented the opposing party in this action and  
28

1  
2  
3 concedes that he withheld this information from Jeong, such that  
4 Jeong "had no reason to know of Xtaren's indemnification clause  
5 with Windsor or that [Kim] was in receipt of the letter Jeong sent  
6 to Windsor." (Kim Decl. ¶ 11.) Kim may well have received bad  
7 advice from KAMA and Xtaren's management which led him to consult  
8 with Jeong, but the fact remains that he went into the meeting with  
9 Jeong knowing that Jeong represented the opposing party. In that  
10 meeting Kim withheld from Jeong the information that would have  
11 triggered Jeong's duty to consider conflicts of interest. In such  
12 circumstances, disqualifying Jeong does not protect a client from  
13 an attorney's conflict of interest because the client has knowingly  
14 created the conflict. If a client knowingly creates a conflict of  
15 interest, he cannot then ask the court to protect him from himself  
16 by disqualifying the innocent attorney.

17 The court is aware that Kim is not an attorney and that  
18 English is apparently not his first language. If Kim had in fact  
19 innocently disclosed significant confidential information, the  
20 court might attempt to craft a solution to preserve the client's  
21 interests. In this case, however, Kim intentionally altered the  
22 facts of the case that he was presenting to Jeong, demonstrating  
23 that he had some sense that he should not be giving Jeong certain  
24 information and reducing the likelihood that he actually  
25 communicated confidential information.

26 Although under normal circumstances a preliminary meeting  
27 between an attorney and a potential client creates a confidential  
28


1 relationship, where, as here, the client went into the meeting with  
2 opposing counsel knowingly and intentionally, it is not appropriate  
3 to disqualify the innocent attorney.

4 **IV. CONCLUSION**

5 For the reasons stated above, the Motion is DENIED.  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Dated: March 20, 2013

  
DEAN D. PREGERSON  
United States District Judge