Patagonia, Inc. v	Chelsea International Inc. et al	Do	c. 92
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7		JS-6	
8			
9 10			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION		
11			
13	PATAGONIA, INC.,	CASE NO. 2:16-cv-08030-JFW (KSx)	
14		CASE NO. 2.10 CV 08050 JFW (KSX)	
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATED FINAL JUDGMENT	
16	V.	AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION	
17	CHELSEA INTERNATIONAL INC.,		
18	CAC INTERNATIONAL GROUP, OTB BRAND WORLDWIDE LTD.,		
19	and MK INT'L GROUP,		
20	Defendants.		
21			
22 23	The Court antors the following St	tinulated Final Judgmont and Dormonant	
23 24	Injunction.	tipulated Final Judgment and Permanent	
24		TION AND VENUE	
26	1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action and over the parties.		
27	 This could has jurisdiction over this detail and over the particle. This action arises under the federal Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051, <i>et</i> 		
20	and the federal Commists Act 17 U.S.C. SS 101 stands		
		1 ORDER Case No. 2:16-cv-08030-JFW (KSx) Dockets.Justia	.com
			1

3. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a) and (b).

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

4. The Court incorporates the findings of fact and conclusions of law from its December 27, 2016 order granting Patagonia's motion for a temporary restraining order, asset restraining order, and seizure order (Dkt. 37), finding that Patagonia was likely to succeed on the merits of its claims of trademark counterfeiting, trademark infringement, trademark dilution, unfair competition, and copyright infringement against Defendants.

5. Defendants' activities have irreparably harmed Patagonia and its famous Fitz Roy Skyline Logo because they strip Patagonia of control of the mark, its goodwill, and its reputation, and link Patagonia's brand with poor-quality goods.

6. The balance of hardships tip in Patagonia's favor. A permanent injunction will not stop Defendants from operating their businesses. Rather, it will merely require that Defendants stop using any counterfeit versions of the Fitz Roy Skyline Logo to market, sell, promote, and distribute their goods. In contrast, Patagonia will continue to suffer permanent, lasting irreparable injury absent injunctive relief.

7. The public interest favors an injunction because it protects the right of the public to be free of further deception and confusion.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

Defendants, their officers, directors, agents, employees, representatives, successors or assigns, and all persons acting in concert or in participation with any of them are permanently enjoined from:

a. using Patagonia's trademarks as set forth in Patagonia's Second
 Amended Complaint (collectively, the "Patagonia Trademarks"); any
 reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of the
 Patagonia Trademarks; or any mark confusingly similar thereto or

1	likely to dilute the Patagonia Trademarks in connection with the
2	manufacturing, distributing, delivering, shipping, importing,
3	exporting, advertising, marketing, promoting, selling, or offering for
4	sale products including vests and other apparel, that are not
5	manufactured by or for Patagonia, nor authorized by Patagonia to be
6	sold or offered for sale (the "Counterfeit Products");
7	b. engaging in unauthorized copying, display, use, and public
8	distribution of Patagonia's copyrighted content, or creating
9	unauthorized derivative works from Patagonia's copyrighted content;
10	c. doing any other acts or other things likely to cause purchasers,
11	consumers, or others to believe that Defendants' products come from
12	Patagonia or its licensees, or are somehow licensed sponsored,
13	endorsed, or authorized by, or otherwise affiliated or connected with,
14	Patagonia;
15	d. moving, returning, destroying, or otherwise disposing of any alleged
16	Counterfeit Products or any products that otherwise bear, contain,
17	display, or utilize any of the Patagonia Trademarks, any derivation or
18	colorable imitation thereof, or any mark confusingly similar thereto or
19	likely to dilute the Patagonia Trademarks;
20	e. otherwise competing unfairly with Patagonia or any of its authorized
21	licensees in any manner, which does not include using the OTB mark
22	separate and apart from any of Patagonia's Trademarks or other
23	intellectual property; and
24	f. assisting, aiding, or abetting any other person or business entity in
25	engaging or performing any of the activities referred to in the above
26	subparagraphs (a) through (e), or effecting any assignments or
27	transfers, forming new entities or associations, or utilizing any other
२ ०	

1	device for the purpose of circumventing or otherwise avoiding the
2	prohibitions set forth in subparagraphs (a) through (e).
3	In view of the foregoing, judgment is hereby entered against Defendants on all
4	counts of the Second Amended Complaint.
5	The Court retains jurisdiction to ensure compliance with the terms of this Order
6	and the separate settlement agreement reached between the parties, and to enable the
7	parties to apply to this Court for further orders.
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.
9	Par 1 for
10	Dated: June 30, 2017 Hon. John F. Walter
11	United States District Judge
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
no	
	A Order