

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  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

LHF PRODUCTIONS, INC,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
DOE 1, *et al.*,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. C16-731RSM  
  
ORDER GRANTING IN PART LHF'S  
MOTIONS FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff LHF Productions, Inc.'s ("LHF") Motion for Default Judgment Against Farnaz Carza (Dkt. #70), Motion for Default Judgment against Valera Kotelevskiy (Dkt. #72), Motion for Default Judgment Against Royd Malama (Dkt. #74), Motion for Default Judgment Against Max Mamotyuk (Dkt. #76), Motion for Default Judgment Against Maria Pedro (Dkt. #78), Motion for Default Judgment Against Monika Cummings (Dkt. #80), Motion for Default Judgment Against Johnson Pham (Dkt. #82), and Motion for Default Judgment Against Reyner Rosas (Dkt. #84). Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, LHF's motions for default judgment (Dkts. #70, #72, #74, #76, #78, #80, #82, and #84) are GRANTED IN PART for the reasons discussed below.

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

## II. BACKGROUND

LHF’s motions for default judgment are just a portion of more than fifty default judgment motions filed by LHF in ten of sixteen related cases before the Court.<sup>1</sup> All sixteen cases assert the same cause of action. LHF alleges that close to two hundred named defendants unlawfully infringed its exclusive copyright to the motion picture *London Has Fallen*, which it developed and produced, by copying and distributing the film over the Internet through a peer-to-peer network using the BitTorrent protocol. Plaintiff uncovered the identities of the alleged infringers after serving several internet service providers (“ISP”s) with subpoenas issued by the Court. Amended complaints identifying the alleged infringers were subsequently filed.

Defendants Carza, Kotelevskiy, Malama, Mamotyuk, Pedro, Cummings, Pham, and Rosas (collectively “Defendants”) are named in the same Amended Complaint because, given the unique identifier associated with a particular digital copy of *London Has Fallen*, along with the timeframe when the internet protocol address associated with a named Defendant accessed that unique identifier, LHF alleges the named Defendants were all part of the same “swarm” of users that reproduced, distributed, displayed, and/or performed the copyrighted work. Dkt. #12 ¶¶ 10, 33-39, 44, 49. According to LHF, “[t]he temporal proximity of the observed acts of each Defendant, together with the known propensity of BitTorrent participants to actively exchange files continuously for hours and even days, makes it possible that Defendants either directly exchanged the motion picture with each other, or did so through intermediaries . . .” *Id.* ¶ 39.

In the instant action, Defendants did not respond to LHF’s Amended Complaint. The Court entered default against Defendants after they failed to respond to LHF’s Amended

---

<sup>1</sup> See Case Nos. C16-551RSM, C16-552RSM, C16-621RSM, C16-623RSM, C16-731RSM, C16-864RSM, C16-865RSM, C16-1015RSM, C16-1017RSM, C16-1175RSM, C16-1089RSM, C16-1090RSM, C16-1273RSM, C16-1354RSM, C16-1588RSM, and C16-1648RSM.

1 Complaint. See Dkts. #60, #61, #62, #63, #64, #65, #66 and #67. LHF’s motions for default  
2 judgment against Defendants are now before the Court.

### 3 III. DISCUSSION

4 Based on this Court’s Order of Default and pursuant to Rule 55(a), the Court has the  
5 authority to enter a default judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b). However, prior to entering default  
6 judgment, the Court must determine whether the well-pleaded allegations of a plaintiff’s  
7 complaint establish a defendant’s liability. *Eitel v. McCool*, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471-72 (9th Cir.  
8 1986). In making this determination, courts must accept the well-pleaded allegations of a  
9 complaint, except those related to damage amounts, as established fact. *Televideo Sys., Inc. v.*  
10 *Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917-18 (9th Cir. 1987). If those facts establish liability the court  
11 may, but has no obligation to, enter a default judgment against a defendant. *Alan Neuman*  
12 *Prods. Inc. v. Albright*, 862 F.2d 1388, 1392 (9th Cir. 1988) (“Clearly, the decision to enter a  
13 default judgment is discretionary.”). Plaintiffs must provide the court with evidence to  
14 establish the propriety of a particular sum of damages sought. *Televideo*, 826 F.2d at 917-18.  
15  
16

#### 17 A. Liability Determination.

18 The allegations in LHF’s Amended Complaint establish Defendants’ liability for  
19 copyright infringement. To establish copyright infringement, LHF must demonstrate  
20 ownership of a valid copyright and that Defendants copied “constituent elements of the work  
21 that are original.” *L.A. Printex Indus., Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.*, 676 F.3d 841, 846 (9th Cir.  
22 2012) (quoting *Feist Publ’ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991)). Here,  
23 LHF alleges it owns the exclusive copyright to the motion picture *London Has Fallen*.  
24 Dkt. #12 ¶¶ 5-9. LHF also alleges that Defendants all participated in the same “swarm” that  
25 unlawfully copied and/or distributed the same digital copy of *London Has Fallen*. *Id.* ¶¶ 10,  
26  
27  
28

1 33-39, 44, 49. Because Defendants did not respond to LHF's complaint, the Court must accept  
2 the allegations in LHF's Amended Complaint as true. *See* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 8(b)(6).  
3 Accordingly, LHF has established Defendants' liability.

4 **B. Default Judgment is Warranted.**

5 The Court must next determine whether to exercise discretion to enter a default  
6 judgment. Courts consider the following factors in making this determination:  
7

8 “(1) the possibility of prejudice to the plaintiff, (2) the merits of plaintiff's  
9 substantive claim, (3) the sufficiency of the complaint, (4) the sum of money at  
10 stake in the action; (5) the possibility of a dispute concerning material facts; (6)  
11 whether the default was due to excusable neglect, and (7) the strong policy  
underlying the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure favoring decisions on the merits.”  
*Eitel*, 782 F.2d at 1471-72.

12 The majority of these factors weigh in favor of granting default judgment against  
13 Defendants. LHF may be prejudiced without the entry of default judgment as it will be left  
14 without a legal remedy. *See Landstar Ranger, Inc. v. Parth Enters, Inc.*, 725 F. Supp. 2d 916,  
15 920 (C.D. Cal. 2010) (finding plaintiff would suffer prejudice where denying default judgment  
16 would leave plaintiff without remedy). LHF's Amended Complaint is also sufficient, and  
17 Defendants did not present any evidence or argument to the contrary. Additionally, the Court  
18 finds there is a low probability that default against Defendants was due to excusable neglect;  
19 Defendants were given ample opportunity to respond to the filings in this matter between the  
20 time they were served with LHF's Amended Complaint and when LHF filed its motions for  
21 default judgment. Finally, although there is a strong policy favoring decisions on the merits,  
22 the Court may consider Defendants' failure to respond to LHF's Amended Complaint and its  
23 subsequent motions as an admission that LHF's motions have merit. *See* Local Civil Rule  
24 7(b)(2) (“[I]f a party fails to file papers in opposition to a motion, such failure may be  
25 considered by the court as an admission that the motion has merit.”).  
26  
27  
28

1           However, the Court acknowledges that a dispute concerning the material facts alleged  
2 by LHF may arise. *See Qotd Film Inv. Ltd. v. Starr*, No. C16-0371RSL, 2016 WL 5817027, at  
3 \*2 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 5, 2016) (acknowledging that dispute concerning material facts may arise  
4 in BitTorrent infringement cases). The Court also acknowledges that the amount at stake is  
5 not, as LHF contends, modest – LHF seeks enhanced statutory damages in the amount of  
6 \$2,500 along with \$2,348 in attorneys’ fees, and between \$92.22 and \$142.22 in costs, for each  
7 named Defendant in this matter. *See* Dkts. #70 at 5-6, #71 ¶¶ 11-12, #72 at 5-6, #73 ¶¶ 11-12,  
8 #74 at 5-6, #75 ¶¶ 11-12, #76 at 5-6, #78 at 5-6, #79 ¶¶ 11-12, #80 at 5-6, #81 ¶¶ 11-12, #82 at  
9 5-6, #83 ¶¶ 11-12, #84 at 5-6, and #85 ¶¶ 11-12. Notwithstanding these considerations, the  
10 *Eitel* factors weigh in favor of granting default judgment against Defendants.  
11

12  
13           C. Appropriate Relief.

14           The Court next considers what relief to grant LHF. LHF seeks the following three  
15 categories of relief from each defendant: (1) permanent injunctive relief; (2) statutory damages;  
16 and (3) attorney’s fees and costs. Each category is discussed in turn below.  
17

18           i. *Permanent Injunctive Relief*

19           Permanent injunctive relief is proper in this matter. Section 502(a) of Title 17 of the  
20 United States Code allows courts to “grant temporary and final injunctions on such terms as it  
21 may deem reasonable to prevent or restrain infringement of a copyright.” As part of a default  
22 judgment, courts may also order the destruction of all copies of a work made or used in  
23 violation of a copyright owner’s exclusive rights. 17 U.S.C. § 503(b). Given the nature of the  
24 BitTorrent system, and because Defendants have been found liable for infringement, the Court  
25 finds Defendants possess the means to continue infringing in the future. *See MAI Sys. Corp. v.*  
26 *Peak Comput., Inc.*, 991 F.2d 511, 520 (9th Cir. 1993) (granting permanent injunction where  
27  
28

1 “liability has been established and there is a threat of continuing violations.”). Consequently,  
2 the Court GRANTS LHF’s request for a permanent injunction against Defendants. The Court  
3 will issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from infringing LHF’s rights in *London*  
4 *Has Fallen*. The Court will also order Defendants to destroy all unauthorized copies of *London*  
5 *Has Fallen*.

6  
7 ii. *Statutory Damages*

8 The Court will also award LHF \$750 in statutory damages for Defendants’ infringement  
9 of the same “seed” file of *London Has Fallen*. The Copyright Act allows plaintiffs to choose  
10 between actual or statutory damages. *See* 17 U.S.C. §§ 504(b), (c)(1). The range of statutory  
11 damages allowed for all infringements involved in an action, with respect to any one work for  
12 which any two or more infringers are jointly and severally liable, is \$750 to \$30,000.  
13 17 U.S.C. §504(c)(1). District courts have “wide discretion in determining the amount of  
14 statutory damages to be awarded, constrained only by the specified maxima and minima,” and  
15 they can take into account whether “the recovery sought is proportional to the harm caused by  
16 defendant’s conduct.” *Harris v. Emus Records Corp.*, 734 F.2d 1329, 1355 (9th Cir. 1984);  
17 *Curtis v. Illumination Arts, Inc.*, 33 F. Supp. 3d 1200, 1212 (W.D. Wash. 2014) (quoting  
18 *Landstar*, 725 F. Supp. 2d at 921). Because the named Defendants in this action were alleged  
19 to have conspired with one another to infringe the same digital copy of LHF’s motion picture,  
20 the Court will award the sum of \$750 for Defendants’ infringement of the same digital copy of  
21 *London Has Fallen*. Each of the Defendants is jointly and severally liable for this amount.

22  
23  
24  
25 LHF argues that a statutory damage award of \$2,500 per defendant should be awarded.  
26 The Court is not persuaded. Statutory damages are not intended to serve as a windfall to  
27 plaintiffs, and enhanced statutory damages are not warranted where plaintiffs do not even try to  
28

1 demonstrate actual damages. Additionally, the Court notes that LHF has not shown that any of  
2 the Defendants is responsible for the “seed” file that provided LHF’s copyrighted work on the  
3 BitTorrent network, and LHF has not presented evidence that Defendants profited from the  
4 infringement.

5 LHF’s additional attempts to justify imposing enhanced statutory damages are also  
6 unpersuasive. *See* Dkts. #70 at 5-6, #72 at 5-6, #74 at 5-6, #76 at 5-6, #78 at 5-6, #80 at 5-6,  
7 #82 at 5-6, and #84 at 5-6. In support of an enhanced award, LHF argues that minimum  
8 statutory awards fail to accomplish the goals of the Copyright Act; LHF argues that defendants  
9 are actually encouraged to disregard court summons and take default judgments when courts  
10 award minimum statutory damages. *Id.* The Court is not convinced. As noted in other  
11 BitTorrent cases within this jurisdiction, “[p]laintiff offers no support for the proposition that  
12 participation in federal litigation should be compelled by imposing draconian penalties that are  
13 out of proportion to the harm caused” by a defendant’s actions. *Qotd Film*, 2016 WL 5817027,  
14 at \*3, n.2.

15 LHF also cites to tweets which appear to mock statutory minimum awards in other  
16 BitTorrent cases. *See* Dkts. #71, Exs. C and D, #73, Exs. C and D, #75, Exs. C and D, #79,  
17 Exs. C and D, #81, Exs. C and D, #83, Exs. C and D, and #85, Exs. C and D. The Court is not  
18 persuaded that viewpoints of individuals not named as defendants in this matter should be  
19 attributed to Defendants. LHF has presented no evidence that Defendants in this case will not  
20 be dissuaded from infringing in the future. Many barriers to accessing and understanding the  
21 legal system exist, and the Court refuses, absent evidence to the contrary, to adopt the position  
22 advocated by LHF. The Court “is [thus] not persuaded that a higher award is appropriate  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 simply because certain members of the BitTorrent community are not impressed by a \$750  
2 award against someone they do not know.” *Qotd Film*, 2016 WL 5817027, at \*3.

3 iii. *Attorneys’ Fees and Costs*

4 Finally, LHF asks the Court to award \$2,348 in attorneys’ fees, and between \$92.22 and  
5 \$142.22 in costs, against each named Defendant in this matter. *See* Dkts. #71 ¶¶ 11-12, #73  
6 ¶¶ 11-12, #75 ¶¶ 11-12, #79 ¶¶ 11-12, #81 ¶¶ 11-12, #83 ¶¶ 11-12, and #85 ¶¶ 11-12. Pursuant  
7 to 17 U.S.C. § 505, the Court “in its discretion may allow the recovery of full costs by or  
8 against any party,” and “may also award a reasonable attorney’s fee to the prevailing party as  
9 part of the costs.”  
10

11 The Court agrees that LHF should be awarded attorneys’ fees. Courts consider several  
12 factors, including “(1) the degree of success obtained, (2) frivolousness, (3) motivation, (4)  
13 objective unreasonableness (legal and factual), and (5) the need to advance considerations of  
14 compensation and deterrence,” when making attorneys’ fee determinations under the Copyright  
15 Act. *Smith v. Jackson*, 84 F.3d 1213, 1221 (9th Cir. 1996) (citing *Jackson v. Axton*, 25 F.3d  
16 884, 890 (9th Cir. 1994)). Because LHF has succeeded on its non-frivolous claims, and  
17 because an award would advance considerations of compensation and deterrence, LHF is  
18 entitled to attorneys’ fees.  
19

20 However, LHF’s attorneys’ fees request is problematic. Courts determine fee award  
21 amounts by first determining a “lodestar figure,” which is obtained by multiplying the number  
22 of hours reasonably expended on a matter by the reasonable hourly rate. *Intel Corp. v.*  
23 *Terabyte Int’l, Inc.*, 6 F.3d 614, 622 (9th Cir. 1993). Courts may then adjust the lodestar with  
24 reference to factors set forth in *Kerr v. Screen Extras Guild, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 67, 69-70 (9th Cir.  
25 1975). The relevant *Kerr* factors here are: (1) the time and labor required; (2) the novelty and  
26  
27  
28

1 difficulty of the questions; and (3) the skill requisite to perform the legal services properly.  
2 “The lodestar amount presumably reflects the novelty and complexity of the issues, the special  
3 skill and experience of counsel, the quality of representation, and the results obtained from the  
4 litigation.” *Intel*, 6 F.3d at 622. Given the nature of the work done by attorney David A. Lowe,  
5 the Court does not find LHF’s requested hourly rate, or the number of hours requested, to be  
6 reasonable.  
7

8 *1. Reasonableness of Rate Requested*

9 In the Ninth Circuit, the determination of a reasonable hourly rate “is not made by  
10 reference to rates actually charged the prevailing party.” *Chalmers v. City of Los Angeles*, 796  
11 F.2d 1205 (9th Cir. 1986). Instead, the reasonable hourly rate is determined with reference to  
12 the prevailing rates charged by attorneys of comparable skill and experience in the relevant  
13 community. *See Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 895 (1984). “Generally, when determining a  
14 reasonable hourly rate, the relevant community is the forum in which the district court sits.”  
15 *Camacho v. Bridgeport Fin., Inc.*, 523 F.3d 973, 979 (9th Cir. 2008). Courts may also consider  
16 “rate determinations in other cases, particularly those setting a rate for the plaintiffs’ attorney”  
17 as “satisfactory evidence of the prevailing market rate.” *United Steelworkers of Am. v. Phelps*  
18 *Dodge Corp.*, 896 F.2d 403, 407 (9th Cir. 1990).  
19  
20

21 Here, Mr. Lowe argues that \$450 is a reasonable rate for his work. However, Mr. Lowe  
22 does not present any evidence that this is the prevailing rate in this community, and similar  
23 cases in this District suggest that a lower rate is appropriate. *See Qotd Film*, 2016 WL 5817027  
24 at \*3-4 (refusing to award requested rate of \$450 where counsel did not present evidence that  
25 this was prevailing community rate). Notably, in two unrelated BitTorrent cases litigated by  
26 Mr. Lowe, courts in this District have awarded Mr. Lowe a rate of \$350 and \$300 for work  
27  
28

1 similar, if not identical, to the work done in this matter. *See Id.* (reducing counsel’s hourly rate  
2 to \$350); *also Dallas Buyers Club, LLC v. Nydam, et al.*, 2016 WL 7719874, at \*5-6 (W.D.  
3 Wash. August 8, 2016) (reducing counsel’s hourly rate to \$300). In *Dallas Buyers Club*, the  
4 Court reasoned that an hourly rate of \$300 is far more appropriate because the cases litigated by  
5 Mr. Lowe did not require extensive skill or experience. 2016 WL 7719847 at \*6. Indeed, it  
6 appears that in litigating *Dallas Buyers Club*, Mr. Lowe, similar to his actions in this case,  
7 recycled pleadings used in other cases and encountered little or no opposition from the named  
8 Defendants. *Id.* Given that Mr. Lowe’s work in this matter amounts to nothing more than form  
9 pleading, the Court adopts the reasoning of other BitTorrent cases in this District and will  
10 reduce Mr. Lowe’s hourly rate to \$300.  
11

## 12 13 2. Reasonableness of Hours Requested

14 Turning to the reasonableness of the hours requested, the Court notes the party seeking  
15 fees “bears the burden of establishing entitlement to an award and documenting the appropriate  
16 hours expended and hourly rates.” *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 437 (1983). The Court  
17 also excludes hours that are not reasonably expended because they are “excessive, redundant,  
18 or otherwise unnecessary.” *Id.* at 434. Further, the Ninth Circuit has held that it is reasonable  
19 for a district court to conclude that the party seeking attorney’s fees fails to carry its burden of  
20 documenting the hours expended when that party engages in “block billing” because block  
21 billing makes it more difficult to determine how much time was spent on particular activities.  
22 *Welch v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, 480 F.3d 942, 948 (9th Cir. 2007).  
23

24 Mr. Lowe requests an unreasonable number of hours. In support of his attorneys’ fees  
25 request, Mr. Lowe has submitted seven, nearly identical, declarations requesting compensation  
26 for 3.1 hours he allegedly spent on each named Defendant. Dkts. #71 ¶¶ 11-12, #73 ¶¶ 11-12,  
27  
28

1 #75 ¶¶11-12, #79 ¶¶ 11-12, #81 ¶¶ 11-12, #83 ¶¶ 11-12, and #85 ¶¶11-12. Mr. Lowe also  
2 requests fees for the 3 hours his associate attorney spent on each named Defendant (at an  
3 hourly rate of \$250), and fees for the 1.4 hours his legal assistant spent on each named  
4 Defendant (at an hourly rate of \$145). *Id.* Mr. Lowe’s activity within this District underscores  
5 the unreasonableness of this request.  
6

7         Since April 2016, Mr. Lowe has filed sixteen cases, each naming LHF as plaintiff,  
8 against hundreds of Doe Defendants.<sup>2</sup> These cases have all proceeded in a similar manner.  
9 Each of the complaints originally filed in these sixteen cases lists Doe Defendants, identified  
10 only by IP addresses, and alleges infringement of LHF’s exclusive rights in the motion picture  
11 *London Has Fallen*. Groups of Doe Defendants are named in the same complaint because they  
12 allegedly infringed the same digital copy of *London Has Fallen* by participating in the same  
13 BitTorrent “swarm.” After nearly identical complaints were filed, LHF, in all sixteen cases,  
14 filed nearly identical motions for expedited discovery. Once the Court granted LHF’s motions  
15 for expedited discovery, LHF then served subpoenas on the ISPs associated with each Doe  
16 Defendant’s IP address. Once the ISPs provided LHF with the Doe Defendants’ identities,  
17 LHF filed amended complaints. Except for the paragraphs identifying the Doe Defendants, all  
18 of the amended complaints are identical. As of the filing of this Order, LHF has named 181  
19 defendants.  
20  
21

22         After amending its complaints, LHF voluntarily dismissed claims against some named  
23 defendants. If a claim is not settled, LHF continues to pursue its claim against the named  
24 defendants. Many of the remaining defendants have not answered LHF’s amended complaints.  
25 A named defendant’s failure to respond to LHF’s amended complaints then prompts LHF to  
26

27 <sup>2</sup> See Case Nos. C16-551RSM, C16-552RSM, C16-621RSM, C16-623RSM, C16-731RSM,  
28 C16-864RSM, C16-865RSM, C16-1015RSM, C16-1175RSM, C16-1017RSM, C16-1089RSM,  
C16-1090RSM, C16-1273RSM, C16-1354RSM, C16-1588RSM, C16-1648RSM.

1 file a motion for default. To date the Court has granted fifty-eight of LHF's motions for default  
2 in eleven of LHF's sixteen cases; LHF is still awaiting response from named defendants in the  
3 five remaining cases. Except for the captions, the motions for default are identical. After the  
4 Court grants LHF's motions for default, LHF files nearly identical motions for default  
5 judgment.  
6

7 While there is nothing wrong with LHF's filing of several infringement claims, it is  
8 wrong for LHF's counsel to file identical complaints and motions with the Court and then  
9 expect the Court to believe that it spent *hundreds* of hours preparing those same complaints and  
10 motions. *See Malibu Media, LLC v. Schelling*, 31 F. Supp. 3d 910, 912-13 (E.D. Mich. 2014)  
11 ("If Malibu Media is experiencing a massive invasion of infringers, it is entitled to seek redress  
12 through the courts."). In this case, Mr. Lowe would have the Court believe that he alone spent  
13 185 hours in preparing the filings of the fifty-one named defendants against whom default  
14 judgment is now sought. This extravagant number of hours does not include the 138.6 hours  
15 claimed by Mr. Lowe's associate attorney, or the 130.4 hours attributed to Mr. Lowe's legal  
16 assistant.  
17  
18

19 There is nothing unique, or complex, about engaging in what can only be described as  
20 "the essence of form pleading," and the Court will not condone unreasonable attorneys' fees  
21 requests. *Malibu*, 31 F. Supp. 3d at 912-13 ("[T]here is nothing unique about this case against  
22 [defendant], it is quite a stretch to suggest that drafting and preparing the complaint for filing  
23 took more than an hour, or that 1.3 hours were spent on drafting a motion for default  
24 judgment."). Here, aside from requesting an unbelievable number of hours, Mr. Lowe has also  
25 engaged in the practice of block billing. *See* Dkts. #71 ¶ 10, #73 ¶ 10, #75 ¶ 10, #79 ¶ 10, #81  
26 ¶ 10, #83 ¶ 10, and #85 ¶ 10. Given this practice, the Court cannot adequately determine the  
27  
28



- 1 3. To the extent any such material exists, Defendants are directed to destroy all  
2 unauthorized copies of *London Has Fallen* in their possession or subject to their  
control;
- 3 4. Defendants are jointly and severally liable for statutory damages in the amount of  
4 \$750;
- 5 5. Defendant Farnaz Carza is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of  
6 \$550 and costs in the amount of \$137.22.
- 7 6. Defendant Valera Kotelevskiy is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the  
8 amount of \$550 and costs in the amount of \$137.22.
- 9 7. Defendant Royd Malama is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of  
10 \$550 and costs in the amount of \$142.22.
- 11 8. Defendant Max Mamotyuk is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of  
12 \$550.<sup>3</sup>
- 13 9. Defendant Maria Pedro is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of  
14 \$550 and costs in the amount of \$142.22.
- 15 10. Defendant Monika Cummings is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the  
16 amount of \$550 and costs in the amount of \$92.22.
- 17 11. Defendant Johnson Pham is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of  
18 \$550 and costs in the amount of \$92.22.
- 19 12. Defendant Reynar Rosas is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of  
20 \$550 and costs in the amount of \$142.22.

21 DATED this 15th day of February, 2017.

22 

23 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
24 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

25  
26  
27  
28 <sup>3</sup> The Court notes that LHF did not file a declaration setting forth the amount of costs sought  
from Defendant Max Mamotyuk.