1		Honorable Robert S. Lasnik
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	WESTERN DISTRICT OF V	VASHINGTON AT SEATTLE
10	ROY FANG,	Case No. 2:13-CV-01926-RSL
11	Plaintiff, v.	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
12	BIG 5 CORP.	MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO FRCP 12(b)(6)
13	Defendant.	
14	This matter a second before the Co	ent en Defendent's Metien Te Dismise Fen
15	This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion To Dismiss For	
16	Failure To State A Claim FRCP 12(b)(6) or In The Alternative, Requiring Plaintiff to Post	
17	Security for Costs (Dkt. # 6). Plaintiff has not responded.	
18	The Court has considered the allegations of the Complaint (Dkt. #1) and taken	
19	judicial notice of Exhibits A – G in Defendant's Request for Judicial Notice. (Dkt. # 7).	
20	Plaintiff is an "alien person" (Dkt. #1 at ¶6), Defendant is a "domestic person," (Dkt. #1 at ¶7)	
21	and Plaintiff's claims are "on account of "Defer	idant's trademark (Dkt. #1 at $\P\P$ 7-13) as those
22	terms are defined in RCW 19.77.170. Plaintiff's Taiwanese trademark is used by Plaintiff	
23	"outside the United States," is not registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office	
24	("PTO"), is not capable of being registered with the PTO, and is junior to Defendant's	
25	trademark. (Dkt. #1 at ¶¶ 13-14). In addition, Plaintiff's claimed trademark does not cover	
26		

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO FRCP 12(b)(6) - 1 (Case No. 2:13-CV-01926-RSL)

1	"retail sporting goods and wearing apparel stores," which are the goods and services identified in		
2	Defendant's PTO-issued trademark. (Dkt. #1 at ¶¶ 13-14).		
3	The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted,		
4	FRCP 12(b)(6), because Plaintiff's trademark is not entitled to Lanham Act protection, and		
5	additionally, because RCW§19.77.170 applies to this action and bars recovery of "money		
6	damages or equitable relief," the very relief sought by Plaintiff. (Complaint, Dkt. $#1, \P 48$ and		
7	Prayer for Relief).		
8	It is ORDERED:		
9	1. The Complaint is dismissed, and		
10	2. The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to the parties, or counsel		
11	for the parties, and to the Domain Name Registrar, eNom, Inc.,		
12	DONE THIS 26th day of March, 2014.		
13			
14	MAS Casnik		
15	Robert S. Lasnik		
16	United States District Judge		
17			
18			
19 20			
20 21			
21			
22			
23 24			
2 4 25			
25 26			