

JS-6

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**

TROWBRIDGE SIDOTI LLP, a
California Limited Liability
Partnership,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KIM LISA TAYLOR, an individual;
and SYNDICATION ATTORNEYS,
PLLC, a Florida Professional Limited
Liability Company,

Defendants.

)
) Case No. 8:16-cv-00771-ODW-SK
)
)

JUDGMENT

This action came before the above-titled Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict on February 23, 2018. (ECF No. 108.) The jury found:

1. Do you find that Kim Taylor transferred her ownership in SYNDICATIONLAWYER.COM to the Trowbridge & Taylor partnership instead of simply allowing the partnership to use it?

Yes. No.

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

If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #2. If you entered “NO” please proceed to question #8.

2. Do you find that Trowbridge & Taylor transferred its ownership in SYNDICATIONLAWYER.COM to the Trowbridge Taylor Sidoti partnership?

Yes. No.

If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #3. If you entered “NO” please proceed to question #8.

3. Do you find that Plaintiff Trowbridge Sidoti LLP (“Plaintiff”) has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it owned, possessed or had the right to possess the SYNDICATIONLAWYER.COM domain?

Yes. No.

If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #4. If you entered “NO”, please proceed to question #8.

4. Do you find that the Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Kim Taylor or Syndication Attorneys PLLC (“Defendants”) intentionally and substantially interfered with Trowbridge Sidoti’s domain, SYNDICATIONLAWYER.COM?

Yes. No.

1 If you entered "YES", then proceed to question #5. If you entered "NO", then
2 proceed to question #8.

3
4 5. Do you find that Plaintiff was harmed?

5
6 _____ Yes. No.

7
8 If you entered "YES", proceed to question #6. If you entered "NO", proceed to
9 question #8.

10
11 6. Do you find that Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing the
12 harm to Plaintiff?

13
14 _____ Yes. _____ No.

15
16 If you entered "YES", proceed to question #7. If you entered "NO", proceed to
17 question #8.

18
19 7. How much has Plaintiff been damaged by Defendants' conduct?

20
21 \$ _____

22
23 8. Do you find Kim Taylor acquired ownership of the domain
24 SYNDICATION LAWYERS.COM when she registered it?

25
26 Yes. _____ No.

27
28 If you entered "YES", proceed to question #10. If "NO", proceed to question #9.

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

9. Do you find that Kim Taylor acquired ownership of the domain SYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM on behalf of Trowbridge & Taylor when she registered it?

Yes. No.

If you entered “YES”, proceed to question #11. If “NO”, proceed to question #10.

10. Do you find that Kim Taylor transferred her ownership in SYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM to the Trowbridge & Taylor partnership instead of simply allowing the partnership to use it?

Yes. No.

If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #11. If you entered “NO” please proceed to question #17.

11. Do you find that Trowbridge & Taylor transferred its ownership in SYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM to the Trowbridge Taylor Sidoti partnership?

Yes. No.

If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #12. If you entered “NO” please proceed to question #17.

1 12. Do you find that Plaintiff Trowbridge Sidoti LLP (“Plaintiff”) has proven by
2 a preponderance of the evidence that it owned, possessed or had the right to
3 possess the SYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM domain?
4

5 Yes. No.
6

7 If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #13. If you entered “NO”, please
8 proceed to question #17.
9

10 13. Do you find that the Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence
11 that Kim Taylor or Syndication Attorneys PLLC (“Defendants”) intentionally and
12 substantially interfered with Trowbridge Sidoti’s domain,
13 SYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM?
14

15 Yes. No.
16

17 If you entered “YES”, then proceed to question #14. If you entered “NO”, then
18 proceed to question #17.
19

20 14. Do you find that Plaintiff was harmed?
21

22 Yes. No.
23

24 If you entered “YES”, proceed to question #15. If you entered “NO”, proceed to
25 question #17.
26
27
28

1 15. Do you find that Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing the
2 harm to Plaintiff?

3
4 Yes. No.

5
6 If you entered "YES, proceed to question #16. If you entered "NO", proceed to
7 question #17.

8
9 16. How much has Plaintiff been damaged by Defendants' conduct?

10
11 \$ 7,800.00

12
13 Please proceed to question #17.

14
15 17. Do you find Kim Taylor acquired ownership of the domain
16 SYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM when she registered it?

17
18 Yes. No.

19
20 If you entered "YES", proceed to question #19. If "NO", proceed to question #18.

21
22 18. Do you find that Kim Taylor acquired ownership of the domain
23 SYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM on behalf of Trowbridge & Taylor when she
24 registered it?

25
26 Yes. No.

27
28 If you entered "YES", proceed to question #20. If "NO", proceed to question #19.

1 19. Do you find that Kim Taylor transferred her ownership in
2 SYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM to the Trowbridge & Taylor partnership
3 instead of simply allowing the partnership to use it?

4
5 Yes. No.

6
7 If you entered "YES", please proceed to question #20. If you entered "NO" please
8 proceed to question #26.

9
10 20. Do you find that Trowbridge & Taylor transferred its ownership in
11 SYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM to the Trowbridge Taylor Sidoti
12 partnership?

13
14 Yes. No.

15
16 If you entered "YES", please proceed to question #21. If you entered "NO" please
17 proceed to question #26.

18
19 21. Do you find that Plaintiff Trowbridge Sidoti LLP ("Plaintiff") has proven by
20 a preponderance of the evidence that it owned, possessed or had the right to
21 possess the SYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM domain?

22
23 Yes. No.

24
25 If you entered "YES", please proceed to question #22. If you entered "NO", please
26 proceed to question #26.

1 22. Do you find that the Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence
2 that Kim Taylor or Syndication Attorneys PLLC (“Defendants”) intentionally and
3 substantially interfered with Trowbridge Sidoti’s domain,
4 SYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM?

5
6 Yes. No.

7
8 If you entered “YES”, then proceed to question #23. If you entered “NO”, then
9 proceed to question #26.

10
11 23. Do you find that Plaintiff was harmed?

12
13 Yes. No.

14
15 If you entered “YES”, proceed to question #24. If you entered “NO”, proceed to
16 question #26.

17
18 24. Do you find that Defendants’ conduct was a substantial factor in causing the
19 harm to Plaintiff?

20
21 Yes. No.

22
23 If you entered “YES” , proceed to question #25. If you entered “NO”, proceed to
24 question #26.

25
26 25. How much has Plaintiff been damaged by Defendants’ conduct?

27
28 \$_____

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

Please proceed to question #26.

26. Do you find Kim Taylor acquired ownership of the domains: PRIVATEMONEYLAW.COM, THESYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM and THESYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM when she registered them?

Yes. No.

If you entered “YES”, proceed to question #28. If “NO”, proceed to question #27.

27. Do you find that Kim Taylor acquired ownership of the domains: PRIVATEMONEYLAW.COM, THESYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM and THESYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM on behalf of the Trowbridge & Taylor partnership when she registered them?

Yes. No.

If you entered “YES”, proceed to question #29. If “NO”, proceed to question #28.

28. Do you find that Kim Taylor transferred her ownership in PRIVATEMONEYLAW.COM, THESYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM and THESYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM to the Trowbridge & Taylor partnership instead of simply allowing the partnership to use it?

Yes. No.

1 If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #29. If you entered “NO” please
2 proceed to question #35.

3
4 29. Do you find that Trowbridge & Taylor transferred its ownership in
5 PRIVATEMONEYLAW.COM, THESYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM and
6 THESYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM to the Trowbridge Taylor Sidoti
7 partnership?

8
9 Yes. No.

10
11 If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #30. If you entered “NO” please
12 proceed to question #35.

13
14 30. Do you find that Plaintiff Trowbridge Sidoti LLP (“Plaintiff”) has proven by
15 a preponderance of the evidence that it owned, possessed or had the right to
16 possess PRIVATEMONEYLAW.COM,
17 THESYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM and
18 THESYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM domains?

19
20 Yes. No.

21
22 If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #31. If you entered “NO”, please
23 proceed to question #35.

24
25 31. Do you find that the Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence
26 that Kim Taylor or Syndication Attorneys PLLC (“Defendants”) intentionally and
27 substantially interfered with Trowbridge Sidoti’s domains:
28

1 PRIVATEMONEYLAW.COM, THESYNDICATIONATTORNEYS.COM and
2 THESYNDICATIONLAWYERS.COM?

3
4 Yes. No.

5
6 If you entered "YES", then proceed to question #32. If you entered "NO", then
7 proceed to question #35.

8 32. Do you find that Plaintiff was harmed?

9
10 Yes. No.

11
12 If you entered "YES" , proceed to question #33. If you entered "NO", proceed to
13 question #35.

14
15 33. Do you find that Defendants' conduct was a substantial factor in causing the
16 harm to Plaintiff?

17
18 Yes. No.

19
20 If you entered "YES" , proceed to question #34. If you entered "NO", proceed to
21 question #35.

22
23 34. How much has Plaintiff been damaged by Defendants' conduct?

24
25 \$ _____

26
27 Please proceed to question #35.

1 35. Do you find Kim Taylor acquired ownership of the domains:
2 [Regaattorney.com](#), [Reg-A.com](#), [Regulation-a.com](#) and [Regulationas.com](#) when
3 Tim Ivey registered them Kim Taylor's account?

4
5 _____ Yes. No.

6 If you entered "YES", proceed to question #37. If "NO", proceed to question #36.

7
8 36. Do you find that Kim Taylor acquired ownership of the domains:
9 [Regaattorney.com](#), [Reg-A.com](#), [Regulation-a.com](#) and [Regulationas.com](#) on behalf
10 of the Trowbridge Taylor Sidoti partnership when Tim Ivey registered them in
11 Kim Taylor's account?

12
13 Yes. _____ No.

14
15 If you entered "YES", proceed to question #38. If "NO", proceed to question #37.

16
17 37. Do you find that Kim Taylor transferred her ownership in
18 [Regaattorney.com](#), [Reg-A.com](#), [Regulation-a.com](#) and [Regulationas.com](#) to the
19 Trowbridge Taylor Sidoti partnership instead of simply allowing the partnership to
20 use it?

21
22 _____ Yes. _____ No.

23
24 If you entered "YES", please proceed to question #38. If you entered "NO" please
25 proceed to question #43.

26
27 38. Do you find that Plaintiff Trowbridge Sidoti LLP ("Plaintiff") has proven by
28 a preponderance of the evidence that it owned, possessed or had the right to

1 possess Regaattorney.com, Reg-A.com, Regulation-a.com and Regulationas.com
2 domains?

3
4 Yes. No.

5
6 If you entered “YES”, please proceed to question #39. If you entered “NO”, please
7 proceed to question #43.

8
9 39. Do you find that the Plaintiff has proven by a preponderance of the evidence
10 that Kim Taylor or Syndication Attorneys PLLC (“Defendants”) intentionally and
11 substantially interfered with Trowbridge Sidoti’s domains: Regaattorney.com,
12 Reg-A.com, Regulation-a.com and Regulationas.com

13
14 Yes. No.

15
16 If you entered “YES”, then proceed to question #40. If you entered “NO”, then
17 proceed to question #43.

18
19 40. Do you find that Plaintiff was harmed?

20
21 Yes. No.

22
23 If you entered “YES” , proceed to question #41. If you entered “NO”, proceed to
24 question #43.

25
26 41. Do you find that Defendants’ conduct was a substantial factor in causing the
27 harm to Plaintiff?
28

1 _____ Yes. _____ No.

2
3 If you entered “YES”, proceed to question #42. If you entered “NO”, proceed to
4 question #43.

5
6 42. How much has Plaintiff been damaged by Defendants’ conduct?

7
8 \$_____

9
10 Please proceed to question #43.

11
12 43. If you entered “No” or did not answer questions: 14, 23, 32, and 40 then sign
13 and date the verdict form. You have completed your deliberations.

14
15 If you entered “Yes” in any of questions: 14, 23, 32 or 40, then proceed to question
16 #44.

17
18 44. If you entered any amounts in response to questions: 16, 25, 34 or 42 then
19 enter the sum of these amounts in the space below.

20
21 \$7,800.00.

22
23 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, pursuant to the
24 jury verdict entered on February 23, 2018 (ECF No. 108), and the Court’s entry of
25 partial summary judgment against Plaintiff’s first, second, and third claims for
26 relief on August 28, 2017 (ECF No. 62), that:

- 27 1. Plaintiff’s first claim for False Designation of Origin (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)),
28 second claim for violation of California Business & Professions Code

1 § 17200, and third claim for violation of common law unfair competition are
2 dismissed with prejudice, as explained in the Court's August 28, 2017,
3 Order. (ECF No. 62.)

4 2. Counterclaimant Kim Lisa Taylor's claim for an accounting is dismissed
5 with prejudice pursuant to a settlement on the record during trial.

6 //

7 //

8 3. Defendants must pay Plaintiff \$7,800.00 in damages, which may be offset
9 against the settlement funds, as set forth on the record at trial, plus post-
10 judgment interest, as may be provided by law.

11
12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13
14 Date: March 6, 2018



15 Hon. Otis D. Wright, II
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28