

E-filing

1 **Kevin R. Martin, SBN 176853**  
kmartin@randicklaw.com  
 2 **Patrick E. Guevara SBN 202727**  
pguevara@randicklaw.com  
 3 **RANDICK O'DEA & TOOLIATOS, LLP**  
 5000 Hopyard Road, Suite 400  
 4 Pleasanton, California 94588  
 Telephone (925) 460-3700  
 5 Facsimile (925) 460-0969

**FILED**  
 OCT 19 2007  
 RICHARD W. WIEKING  
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 OAKLAND

*File*  
*pod*  
 NP  
 9

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff Vallavista Corporation

7  
 8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 9 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
 10 **SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND DIVISION**

**BY FAX**

ADR

12 VALLAVISTA CORPORATION, a  
California corporation,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware  
 16 corporation, TARGET  
 CORPORATION, a Minnesota  
 17 corporation, EBAGS, INC., a  
 Colorado corporation, EMPORIUM  
 18 LEATHER COMPANY, INC., a New  
 Jersey corporation, doing business as  
 19 ROYCE LEATHER, and FASHION  
 HANDBAGS, INC., a Nevada  
 20 corporation, doing business as BO  
 BO BAGS,

21 Defendants.

Case No.:

**C07-05360PVT**

**COMPLAINT FOR TRADEMARK  
INFRINGEMENT, DILUTION, UNFAIR  
COMPETITION, AND INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

[DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL]

23 Plaintiff Vallavista Corporation ("Plaintiff"), by and through its undersigned counsel, for  
 24 its Complaint against Defendants Amazon.com Inc., a Delaware corporation ("Amazon"), Target  
 25 Corporation, a Minnesota corporation ("Target"), eBags, Inc., a Colorado corporation ("eBags"),  
 26 Emporium Leather Company Inc., a New Jersey corporation doing business as ROYCE  
 27 LEATHER ("Royce"), and Fashion Handbags, Inc., a Nevada corporation, doing business as BO

1 BO BAGS ("Bo Bo Bags") (collectively "Defendants") states the following:

2 **I. PARTIES**

3 1. Plaintiff is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, with  
4 its principal place of business located at 3541 Wilkinson Lane, Lafayette, California 94549.

5 2. Upon information and belief, Amazon is a corporation organized under the laws  
6 of the State of Delaware and is conducting systematic and continuous business in California  
7 through its website: <http://www.amazon.com> and other interactions.

8 3. Upon information and belief, Target is a corporation organized under the laws of  
9 the State of Minnesota and is conducting systematic and continuous business through its more  
10 than 200 store locations in California and through its website: <http://www.target.com> and other  
11 interactions.

12 4. Upon information and belief, eBags is a corporation organized under the laws of  
13 the State of Colorado and is conducting systematic and continuous business in California through  
14 its website: <http://www.ebags.com> and other interactions.

15 5. Upon information and belief, Royce is a corporation organized under the laws of  
16 the State of New Jersey and is conducting systematic and continuous business in California  
17 through its website: <http://www.royceleathergifts.com/>, <http://www.amazon.com>,  
18 <http://www.ebags.com> and other interactions.

19 6. Upon information and belief, Bo Bo Bags is a corporation organized under the  
20 laws of the State of Nevada and is conducting systematic and continuous business in California  
21 through websites such as <http://www.amazon.com>, <http://www.ebags.com>,  
22 <http://www.shoebuy.com>, and other interactions.

23 **II. JURISDICTION**

24 7. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §  
25 1121 (actions arising under the Trademark Act of 1946), 15 U.S.C. § 1114 (registration of a  
26 mark is prima facie evidence of its validity), 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (false designation of origin and  
27 dilution), 28 U.S.C. 1338(a) (acts of Congress relating to trademarks), 28 U.S.C. 1338(b)

1 (pendent unfair competition claims) and 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) (diversity of citizenship). The  
2 amount in question herein exceeds \$75,000.

3 8. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a), venue is proper in the Northern District of California  
4 because a substantial part of the events giving rise to this action occurred here.

### 5 III. INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

6 9. Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-2(d), assignment to either the San Francisco Division or  
7 Oakland Division is proper because a substantial part of the events giving rise to this action  
8 occurred in Contra Costa County, California.

### 9 IV. ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

10 10. This is an action for trademark infringement, dilution, and false designation of  
11 origin under the Trademark Act of 1946 (also known as The Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051 *et*  
12 *seq.*) and unfair competition under California Business & Professions Code Section 17200 *et seq.*  
13 and the common law based on the Defendants' use of the name and mark TAXI WALLET® and  
14 other unlawful activities conducted by Defendants in connection with such use.

15 11. Plaintiff is the owner of United States Trademark Registration No. 2,008,495  
16 issued on October 15, 1996, for TAXI WALLET® (the design plus words, letters and/or  
17 numbers) used in connection with the sale of wallets, coin wallets, billfolds, credit card wallets,  
18 coin purses, change purses, coin pocket billfolds and business card wallets (collectively  
19 "Wallets") in International Class 018. A true and correct copy of the U.S. Patent and Trademark  
20 certificate of trademark registration is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as  
21 Exhibit A ("Registration").

22 12. The Registration is in full force and effect and uncanceled. The Registration is  
23 incontestable and thus constitutes conclusive evidence of the validity of the TAXI WALLET®  
24 mark, Plaintiff's ownership thereof, and its exclusive right to use the TAXI WALLET® mark  
25 throughout the United States.

26 13. The mark TAXI WALLET® is inherently distinctive when used in connection  
27 with Plaintiff's Wallets.

1           14.     Continuously since on or about July 6, 1988, Plaintiff has been and now is  
2 extensively engaged in the business of selling Wallets under the mark TAXI WALLET  
3 throughout the United States. As a result of the widespread use and display of the TAXI  
4 WALLET trademark, the public and the trade use them to identify and refer to Plaintiff's  
5 products, the public and trade recognize that such designations refer to a high quality product  
6 emanating from a single source, and said trademark has built up secondary meaning and  
7 extensive goodwill. Together, plaintiffs registered trademark TAXI WALLET® and common  
8 law word mark TAXI WALLET are referred to as "Marks."

9           15.     Plaintiff has also created a distinctive design for Wallets sold under the Marks.  
10 Plaintiff's unique design is illustrated in the drawings attached hereto and incorporated herein by  
11 reference as Exhibit B ("Trade Dress").

12           16.     Plaintiff's Trade Dress is not essential to the functionality of Wallets and does not  
13 affect the quality or cost of Wallets.

14           17.     Continuously since on or about July 6, 1988, Plaintiff has been and now is  
15 extensively engaged in the business of selling Wallets under the Marks and Trade Dress.

16           18.     The Marks are used extensively on and in connection with the sales of Plaintiff's  
17 Wallets, including the packaging, promotional and marketing materials, and advertising on the  
18 Internet.

19           19.     Plaintiff has extensively promoted and marketed its Wallets nationwide through  
20 various forms of media, including the Internet, in connection with the Marks and Trade Dress.

21           20.     As a result of such promotional and marketing efforts, and the inherent quality of  
22 Plaintiff's Wallets, the Marks and Trade Dress have become widely and favorably known, have  
23 become symbols of Plaintiff's goodwill, and have acquired distinctiveness and secondary  
24 meaning.

25           21.     Plaintiff has continuously and vigorously preserved the strength of the Marks and  
26 Trade Dress and has actively guarded against infringement.

27           22.     Notwithstanding Plaintiff's continuous and exclusive use of and prior rights in the  
28

1 Marks, Defendants have sought to compete unfairly with Plaintiff by using the Marks on and in  
2 connection with selling Wallets.

3 23. In addition to the misappropriation of the Marks, Plaintiff is informed and  
4 believes that Defendants may have misappropriated other marks of Plaintiff. As such, this  
5 Complaint may be amended to include additional claims.

6 **V. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**  
7 **COUNT ONE: TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT UNDER 15 U.S.C. § 1114**

8 **As to All Defendants:**

9 24. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of  
10 paragraphs 1 through 23 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

11 25. Defendants have used designations identical or substantially similar to the Marks  
12 for the sale, offer for sale, advertisement, or promotion of Wallets.

13 26. Defendants' use of designations identical or substantially similar to the Marks, as  
14 described herein, is without permission or authority of Plaintiff and is likely to cause confusion  
15 and mistake or to deceive consumers as to the source or origin of goods. Defendants actions  
16 described herein constitutes infringement of Plaintiff's federally-registered trademark in  
17 violation of Lanham Act Section 32, 15 U.S.C. § 1114.

18 27. Upon information and belief, Defendants' infringing activities have caused and,  
19 unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause, irreparable injury and other damage to  
20 Plaintiff's business, reputation and goodwill in its federally registered TAXI WALLET®  
21 trademark. Plaintiff has no other adequate remedy at law.

22 28. By the reason of Defendants activities described herein, Plaintiff is entitled to  
23 injunctive relief against all Defendants restraining further acts of infringement, to attorneys fees,  
24 and trebled damages caused by Defendants' infringement of Plaintiff's TAXI WALLET®  
25 trademark.

26 **As To Defendant Bo Bo Bags:**

27 29. Bo Bo Bags is a merchant in the business of selling leather goods in the United  
28

1 States and in competition with Plaintiff.

2 30. Bo Bo Bags has sold and continues to sell in interstate commerce wallets  
3 designated as a "Taxi Wallet" with designs identical or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's Trade  
4 Dress through electronic commerce websites such as <http://www.amazon.com> and  
5 <http://www.ebags.com>.

6 31. Plaintiff has not given Bo Bo Bags any authorization to use the Marks or the  
7 Trade Dress.

8 32. Bo Bo Bags' actions described herein are likely to cause confusion and mistake or  
9 to deceive consumers as to the source or origin of goods.

10 33. Upon information and belief, Bo Bo Bags' acts described herein have been  
11 malicious, deliberate, willful, intentional, and in bad faith, committed with full knowledge and  
12 conscious disregard of Plaintiff's prior and superior rights in the Marks and Trade Dress and  
13 with an intent to trade on Plaintiff's substantial goodwill in the Marks and Trade Dress.  
14 Therefore, this is an exceptional case pursuant to Lanham Act Section 35(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1114.

15 **As To Defendant Royce:**

16 34. Royce is a merchant in the business of selling leather goods in competition with  
17 Plaintiff.

18 35. Royce has sold and continues to sell in interstate commerce wallets designated as  
19 a "Taxi Wallet" with designs identical or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's Trade Dress through  
20 its own electronic commerce website <http://www.royceleathergifts.com/> and through other  
21 electronic commerce websites such as <http://www.amazon.com> and <http://www.send.com>.

22 36. Plaintiff has not given Royce any authorization to use the Marks or the Trade  
23 Dress.

24 37. On May 30, 2007, Plaintiff sent a letter to Royce demanding that it cease and  
25 desist all use of the TAXI WALLET® mark, Trade Dress, or any other name or mark  
26 confusingly similar to the TAXI WALLET® mark or Trade Dress.

27 38. On July 13, 2007, Royce, through its attorney, acknowledged receipt of Plaintiff's  
28

1 cease and desist demands but did not agree to comply.

2 39. Despite receiving notice of its infringement of Plaintiff's TAXI WALLET® mark  
3 and Trade Dress, Royce continues to sell, in interstate commerce, wallets identical in style and  
4 design to Plaintiff's Trade Dress that are packaged and labeled as "Taxi Wallet" or "Royce  
5 Leather Taxi Wallet". These actions are likely to cause confusion and mistake or to deceive  
6 consumers as to the source or origin of goods.

7 40. Upon information and belief, Royce's acts described herein have been malicious,  
8 deliberate, willful, intentional, and in bad faith, committed with full knowledge and conscious  
9 disregard of Plaintiff's prior and superior rights in the Marks and Trade Dress and with an intent  
10 to trade on Plaintiff's substantial goodwill in the Marks and Trade Dress. Therefore, this is an  
11 exceptional case pursuant to Lanham Act Section 35(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1114.

12 **As to Defendant Target:**

13 41. As recent as May 16, 2007, Target was advertising and selling wallets called  
14 "Isaac Mizrahi for Target Taxi Wallet with Turn Lock".

15 42. Plaintiff has not given Target any authorization to use the Marks.

16 43. On May 22, 2007, Plaintiff sent a letter to Target protesting its infringement of the  
17 mark TAXI WALLET® in connection with the promotion and sale of wallets.

18 44. On May 31, 2007, Plaintiff received a response letter from Target indicating that  
19 it removed the word "taxi" from the website <http://www.target.com>.

20 45. On or about September 28, 2007, counsel for Plaintiff browsed the website  
21 <http://www.target.com> and conducted a website search using the keyword "taxi wallet". This  
22 search resulted links to purchase directly online the same wallets that Target formerly designated  
23 as "Isaac Mizrahi for Target Taxi Wallet with Turn Lock."

24 46. Upon information and belief, Target is using "taxi wallet" as a keyword in its  
25 website to sell, offer for sale, promote and advertise Wallets that do not originate from Plaintiff.

26 47. Target's acts described herein are not authorized by Plaintiff and are likely to  
27 cause confusion and mistake or to deceive consumers as to the source or origin of goods.

28

7

1           48.     Upon information and belief, Target's acts described herein have been malicious,  
2 deliberate, willful, intentional, and in bad faith, committed with full knowledge and conscious  
3 disregard of Plaintiff's prior and superior rights in the Marks and with an intent to trade on  
4 Plaintiff's substantial goodwill in the Marks. Therefore, this is an exceptional case pursuant to  
5 Lanham Act Section 35(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1114.

6           **As to Defendant Amazon:**

7           49.     Amazon operates retail electronic commerce websites for nationwide businesses  
8 such as Target, the NBA, Sears Canada, Sears UK, Benefit Cosmetics, Bebe Stores, Timex  
9 Corporation, Marks & Spencer, Mothercare, Bombay Company and others.

10          50.     Upon information and belief, Amazon has used and is using "taxi wallet" as a  
11 search keyword in its website to sell, offer for sale, promote and advertise Wallets that do not  
12 originate from Plaintiff and are designated with the Marks.

13          51.     On or about March 19, 2007, Plaintiff notified Amazon of the infringing products  
14 sold on the Amazon.com website and demanded that Amazon cease sales of such products.

15          52.     On or about October 8, 2007, counsel for Plaintiff browsed the website  
16 <http://www.amazon.com> and conducted a website search using the keyword "taxi wallet". This  
17 search resulted links to purchase Wallets designated with the Marks that did not originate from  
18 Plaintiff adjacent to links that sell Plaintiff's authentic TAXI WALLET goods.

19          53.     Amazon's acts described herein are not authorized by Plaintiff and are likely to  
20 cause confusion and mistake or to deceive consumers as to the source or origin of goods.

21          54.     Upon information and belief, Amazon's acts described herein have been  
22 malicious, deliberate, willful, intentional, and in bad faith, committed with full knowledge and  
23 conscious disregard of Plaintiff's prior and superior rights in the Marks and with an intent to  
24 trade on Plaintiff's substantial goodwill in the Marks. Therefore, this is an exceptional case  
25 pursuant to Lanham Act Section 35(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1114.

26           **As to Defendant eBags:**

27          55.     eBags operates a retail electronic commerce website selling bags, luggage, travel  
28



1 accessories, and wallets.

2 56. Upon information and belief, eBags has used and is using "taxi wallet" as a search  
3 keyword in its website to sell, offer for sale, promote and advertise Wallets that do not originate  
4 from Plaintiff.

5 57. On or about October 10, 2007, counsel for Plaintiff browsed the website  
6 <http://www.ebags.com> and conducted a website search using the keyword "taxi wallet". This  
7 search resulted links to purchase Wallets designated with the Marks that did not originate from  
8 Plaintiff. The eBags.com website offered for sale Wallets that are designed exactly or  
9 confusingly similar to Plaintiff's Trade Dress and designated "Perlina Taxi Wallet," "Bo Bo  
10 Bags Turbo Diesel Italian Taxi Wallet," "Tony Perotti Prima Traditional Taxi Wallet," or "Bo  
11 Bo Bags Italian Taxi Wallet."

12 58. Upon information and belief, eBags has sold and is selling Wallets that originate  
13 from Defendant Bo Bo Bags.

14 59. eBags' acts described herein are not authorized by Plaintiff and are likely to cause  
15 confusion and mistake or to deceive consumers as to the source or origin of goods.

16 60. Upon information and belief, eBags' acts described herein have been malicious,  
17 deliberate, willful, intentional, and in bad faith, committed with full knowledge and conscious  
18 disregard of Plaintiff's prior and superior rights in the Marks and with an intent to trade on  
19 Plaintiff's substantial goodwill in the Marks. Therefore, this is an exceptional case pursuant to  
20 Lanham Act Section 35(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1114.

21  
22 **COUNT TWO: UNFAIR COMPETITION AND FALSE DESIGNATION**  
23 **OF ORIGIN UNDER 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)**  
24 **(AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS)**

25 61. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of  
26 paragraphs 1 through 60 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

27 62. By engaging in the acts described herein, Defendants have made and are making  
28 false, deceptive, and misleading statements constituting unfair competition, false representations,

1 false designations of origin, and false advertising made in connection with goods distributed in  
2 interstate commerce in violation of Lanham Act Section 43(a), 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

3 63. Upon information and belief, Defendants' acts described herein have caused, and  
4 unless enjoined by this Court will continue to cause, irreparable injury and other damage to  
5 Plaintiff's business, reputation and good will in its trademarks, trade dress, and trade names.  
6 Plaintiff has no other adequate remedy at law.

7 64. By the reason of Defendants' acts described herein, Plaintiff is entitled to  
8 injunctive relief against all Defendants restraining further acts of unfair competition, false  
9 representations, false designations of origin, and false advertising, to attorneys fees, and trebled  
10 damages caused by Defendants' unlawful actions.

11 **COUNT THREE: TRADEMARK DILUTION UNDER 15 U.S.C. § 1125(C)**  
12 **(AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS)**

13 65. Plaintiff hereby realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of  
14 paragraphs 1 through 64 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

15 66. Plaintiff's Marks are highly recognized and widely used in interstate commerce in  
16 the United States.

17 67. Plaintiff's Marks are "famous" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(1) for the  
18 reasons stated above.

19 68. Defendants used designations identical or substantially similar to Plaintiff's  
20 Marks in interstate commerce after Plaintiff's Marks became famous.

21 69. The acts of Defendants as described herein are commercial uses that dilute and  
22 tarnish Plaintiff's Marks in violation of the Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1996, 15 U.S.C. §  
23 1125(c).

24 70. By the reason of Defendants' acts described herein, Plaintiff is entitled to  
25 injunctive relief against all Defendants restraining further acts of dilution, to attorneys fees, and  
26 trebled damages caused by Defendants' dilution of the Marks.

1                                   **COUNT FOUR: COMMON LAW UNFAIR COMPETITION**  
2                                   **(AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS)**

3           71.    Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1  
4 through 70 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

5           72.    Defendants' acts described herein constitute unfair competition within the State of  
6 California and are in violation of California law.

7           73.    Upon information and belief, Defendants' unfair competition have caused, and  
8 unless enjoined by this Court will continue to cause, irreparable injury and other damage to  
9 Plaintiff's business, reputation and good will in its trademarks, trade dress, and trade names.  
10 Plaintiff has no other adequate remedy at law.

11          74.    By the reason of Defendants' acts described herein, Plaintiff is entitled to  
12 injunctive relief against all Defendants restraining further acts of unfair competition, to attorneys  
13 fees, and damages caused by Defendants' unlawful actions.

14                               **COUNT FIVE: UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND**  
15                               **PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200 ET SEQ.**  
16                               **(AS TO ALL DEFENDANTS)**

17          75.    Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1  
18 through 74 of this Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

19          76.    Defendants' activities as stated herein constitute false advertising and unfair and  
20 deceptive acts and practices in the conduct of its trade and business in violation of the California  
21 Business and Professions Code Section 17200 *et seq.*

22          77.    Upon information and belief, Defendants' wrongful and deceptive activities have  
23 caused, and unless enjoined by this Court will continue to cause, irreparable injury and other  
24 damage to Plaintiff's business, reputation and good will in its trademarks, trade dress, and trade  
25 names. Plaintiff has no other adequate remedy at law.

26                               **PRAYER FOR RELIEF:**

27          WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment to be entered in its favor and against  
28 Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

1 a. That Defendants, their agents, servants, employees, representatives, attorneys  
2 subsidiaries, related companies, successors, assigns, and all others in active concert or  
3 participation with Defendants, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined and restrained from  
4 using in any manner the TAXI WALLET® or TAXI WALLET marks, any colorable imitation of  
5 the Marks, or any mark, name, or designation confusingly similar to the Marks in connection  
6 with the sales, advertising or promotion of goods that do not originate from Plaintiff.

7 b. That Bo Bo Bags, Royce, their agents, servants, employees, representatives,  
8 attorneys subsidiaries, related companies, successors, assigns, and all others in active concert or  
9 participation with the defendants referenced in this paragraph, be preliminarily and permanently  
10 enjoined and restrained from using in any manner Plaintiff's Trade Dress, any colorable  
11 imitation of Plaintiff's Trade Dress, or any design confusingly similar to Plaintiff's Trade Dress.

12 c. That Defendants, their agents, servants, employees, representatives, attorneys  
13 subsidiaries, related companies, successors, assigns, and all others in active concert or  
14 participation with Defendants, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined and restrained from  
15 unfairly competing with Plaintiff, from engaging in unfair and deceptive trade practices, and  
16 from injuring Plaintiff's goodwill or business reputation;

17 d. That Defendants, their agents, servants, employees, representatives, attorneys  
18 subsidiaries, related companies, successors, assigns, and all others in active concert or  
19 participation with Defendants, be ordered to take affirmative steps to dispel any and all false  
20 impressions that have been created by Defendants' use of designations, names, marks, or designs  
21 identical or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's Marks and Trade Dress.

22 e. That Defendants be ordered to deliver up for impoundment during the pendency  
23 of this action all products, fixtures, writings, signage, artwork, nameplates, labels,  
24 advertisements, and other materials incorporating or reproducing Plaintiff's Marks and Trade  
25 Dress;

26 f. That Defendants, upon final disposition of this matter, destroy all products,  
27 fixtures, writings, signage, artwork, nameplates, labels, advertisements, and other materials  
28

1 incorporating or reproducing the infringement on Plaintiff's Marks or Trade Dress, pursuant to  
2 Lanham Act Section 36 (15 U.S.C. § 1118), Section 17200 *et seq.* of the California Business and  
3 Professions Code, and the equitable power of this Court to enforce the laws of the State of  
4 California.

5 g. That Defendants be required to account to Plaintiff for any and all money, profits  
6 and advantages wrongfully received by Defendants, including any and all profits derived from  
7 the sale of goods bearing or sold under the infringing marks and trade dress, and interest thereon;

8 h. That Plaintiff be awarded its damages in an amount to be determined at trial;

9 i. That Plaintiff's recovery be trebled pursuant to Lanham Act Section 35, 15 U.S.C.  
10 § 1117;

11 j. That Plaintiff be awarded punitive damages pursuant to the laws of the State of  
12 California in view of Defendants' intentional and willful infringement and unfair competition;

13 k. That Plaintiff be awarded attorneys' fees, expenses and costs incurred in this  
14 action pursuant to Lanham Act Section 35, 15 U.S.C. § 1117; and

15 l. For such other and further relief as may be just and equitable.

16 **VI. JURY DEMAND**

17 Plaintiff hereby requests a jury trial for all claims and causes of action triable by jury.

18 Respectfully Submitted,

19 Date: October 18, 2007

RANDICK O'DEA & TOOLIATOS, LLP

21 By: 

22 Patrick E. Guevara


23 Attorneys for Plaintiff Vallavista Corporation

Int. Cl.: 18

Prior U.S. Cls.: 1, 2, 3, 22 and 41

**United States Patent and Trademark Office** Reg. No. 2,008,495  
Registered Oct. 15, 1996

**TRADEMARK  
PRINCIPAL REGISTER**



VALLAVISTA CORPORATION (CALIFORNIA  
CORPORATION)  
3431 BLACKHAWK PLAZA CIRCLE  
DANVILLE, CA 94506


FOR: WALLETS, COIN WALLETS, BILL-  
FOLDS, CREDIT CARD WALLETS, COIN  
PURSES, CHANGE PURSES, COIN POCKET  
BILLFOLDS, BUSINESS CARD WALLETS, IN  
CLASS 18 (U.S. CLS. 1, 2, 3, 22 AND 41).



FIRST USE 7-6-1988; IN COMMERCE  
7-29-1988.

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE  
RIGHT TO USE "WALLET", APART FROM  
THE MARK AS SHOWN.

SER. NO. 75-018,738, FILED 11-9-1995.

GEORGE LORENZO, EXAMINING ATTORNEY





PERIGAD 800-831-8689  
EXHIBIT  
B