

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

7 LHF PRODUCTIONS, INC.,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 VICTOR RODRIGUEZ, an individual;
11 JASON STANFEL, an individual;
12 KIMBERLY BARRETT, an individual;
13 CONNIE PIERRE, an individual;
JOYANN STONE, an individual;
AMBER MCCLEAN, an individual; and
CARMEN IFIERRO, an individual;

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C16-1090RSM

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT
JUDGMENT AGAINST DEFENDANTS

15
16 **I. INTRODUCTION**

17 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment against
18 Defendants. Dkt. #55. Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record
19 and for the reasons discussed below, Plaintiff's Motion is granted in part.

20
21 **II. BACKGROUND**

22 Plaintiff's motion for default judgment is just one of more than fifty default judgment
23 motions filed by Plaintiff in eighteen related cases before the Court.¹ All eighteen cases assert

24
25
26 ¹ See Case Nos. C16-551RSM, C16-552RSM, C16-621RSM, C16-623RSM, C16-731RSM,
C16-864RSM, C16-865RSM, C16-1015RSM, C16-1017RSM, C16-1089RSM, C16-1090RSM,
C16-1175RSM, C16-1273RSM, C16-1354RSM, C16-1588RSM, C16-1648RSM, C17-
254RSM, and C17-782RSM.

1 the same cause of action. Plaintiff alleges that close to two hundred named defendants unlawfully
2 infringed its exclusive copyright to the motion picture *London Has Fallen*, which it developed
3 and produced, by copying and distributing the film over the Internet through a peer-to-peer
4 network using the BitTorrent protocol. Plaintiff uncovered the identities of the alleged infringers
5 after serving several internet service providers (“ISPs”) with subpoenas issued by the Court.
6 Amended complaints identifying the alleged infringers were subsequently filed.

7
8 Defendants Victor Rodriguez, Jason Stanfel, Kimberly Barrett, Connie Pierre, Joyann
9 Stone, Amber McClean, and Carmen Ifierro (collectively “Defendants”), are named in the same
10 Amended Complaint because, given the unique identifier associated with a particular digital copy
11 of *London Has Fallen*, along with the timeframe when the internet protocol address associated
12 with Defendants accessed that unique identifier, Plaintiff alleges Defendants were all part of the
13 same “swarm” of users that reproduced, distributed, displayed, and/or performed the copyrighted
14 work. Dkt. #11 at ¶¶ 10, 27–33, 38, 43. According to Plaintiff, “[t]he temporal proximity of the
15 observed acts of each Defendant, together with the known propensity of BitTorrent participants
16 to actively exchange files continuously for hours and even days, makes it possible that
17 Defendants either directly exchanged the motion picture with each other, or did so through
18 intermediaries” *Id.* at ¶ 33.

19
20 Defendants have not participated in this action and default was entered against each.
21 Dkts. #44–#48 and #50–#51. Plaintiff now seeks default judgment against Defendants. Dkt.
22 #55.

23 24 III. DISCUSSION

25 Based on this Court’s Orders of Default and pursuant to Rule 55(a), the Court has the
26 authority to enter a default judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(b). However, prior to entering default

1 judgment, the Court must determine whether the well-pleaded allegations of a plaintiff's
2 complaint establish a defendant's liability. *Eitel v. McCool*, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471–72 (9th Cir.
3 1986). In making this determination, courts must accept the well-pleaded allegations of a
4 complaint, except those related to damage amounts, as established fact. *Televideo Sys., Inc. v.*
5 *Heidenthal*, 826 F.2d 915, 917–18 (9th Cir. 1987). If those facts establish liability the court may,
6 but has no obligation to, enter a default judgment against a defendant. *Alan Neuman Prods. Inc.*
7 *v. Albright*, 862 F.2d 1388, 1392 (9th Cir. 1988) (“Clearly, the decision to enter a default
8 judgment is discretionary.”). Plaintiffs must provide the court with evidence to establish the
9 propriety of a particular sum of damages sought. *Televideo*, 826 F.2d at 917–18.

11 A. Liability Determination.

12 The allegations in Plaintiff's Amended Complaint establish Defendants' liability for
13 copyright infringement. To establish copyright infringement, Plaintiff must demonstrate
14 ownership of a valid copyright and that Defendants copied “constituent elements of the work that
15 are original.” *L.A. Printex Indus., Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.*, 676 F.3d 841, 846 (9th Cir. 2012)
16 (quoting *Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co.*, 499 U.S. 340, 361 (1991)). Here, Plaintiff
17 alleges it owns the exclusive copyright to the motion picture *London Has Fallen*. Dkt. #11 at
18 ¶¶ 5–9. Plaintiff also alleges that Defendants all participated in the same “swarm” that
19 unlawfully copied and/or distributed the same digital copy of *London Has Fallen*. Dkt. #11 at
20 ¶¶ 10, 27–33, 38, 43. Because Defendants did not respond to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint,
21 the Court must accept the allegations in Plaintiff's Amended Complaint as true. *See Fed. R. Civ.*
22 *P. 8(b)(6)*. Accordingly, Plaintiff has established Defendants' liability.

1 B. Default Judgment is Warranted.

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

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

9 *Eitel*, 782 F.2d at 1471-72.

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

25 However, the Court acknowledges that a dispute concerning the material facts alleged by
26 Plaintiff may arise. *See Qotd Film Inv. Ltd. v. Starr*, No. C16-371RSL, 2016 WL 5817027, at

1 *2 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 5, 2016) (acknowledging that a dispute concerning material facts may arise
2 in BitTorrent infringement cases). The Court also acknowledges that the amount at stake is not
3 modest, as Plaintiff contends. Plaintiff seeks enhanced statutory damages in the amount of
4 \$2,500, along with \$1,069.50 in attorneys' fees, and costs ranging from \$110 to \$160, for each
5 named Defendant in this matter. Dkt. #55 at 4; Dkt. #57-1² at ¶¶ 11–14. Notwithstanding these
6 considerations, the *Eitel* factors weigh in favor of granting default judgment against Defendants.
7

8 C. Appropriate Relief.

9 The Court next considers what relief to grant Plaintiff. Plaintiff seeks the following three
10 categories of relief from Defendants: (1) permanent injunctive relief; (2) statutory damages; and
11 (3) attorneys' fees and costs. Each category is discussed in turn below.

12 i. *Permanent Injunctive Relief*

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

24
25 ² Plaintiff filed a declaration by Mr. Lowe in support of its Motion for Default Judgment. Dkt.
26 #56. Plaintiff subsequently filed a praecipe to Mr. Lowe's declaration indicating that it corrected
typographical errors. Dkt. #57. It appears that the corrected declaration actually corrected a
math error, substantively changing the fees requested by Plaintiff. Nevertheless, the Court
accepts Mr. Lowe's amended declaration and considers it pursuant to Local Rule 7(m).

1 Court grants Plaintiff's request for a permanent injunction against Defendants. The Court will
2 issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from infringing Plaintiff's rights in *London*
3 *Has Fallen*. The Court will also order Defendants to destroy all unauthorized copies of *London*
4 *Has Fallen*.

5 ii. *Statutory Damages*

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

20 Plaintiff argues that a joint and several statutory damage award of \$2,500 should be
21 awarded. Plaintiff argues that an increased award is justified because of the number of
22 Defendants involved and that "each obtained a separate copy of the movie." Dkt. #55 at 4. But
23 this argument cuts directly against Plaintiff's Amended Complaint in which it alleges that "each
24
25
26

1 Defendant participated in a swarm and/or reproduced and/or distributed the same seed file of
2 *London Has Fallen*.” Dkt. #11 at ¶ 43 (underline emphasis added). Further, statutory damages
3 are not intended to serve as a windfall to plaintiffs, and enhanced statutory damages are not
4 warranted where plaintiffs do not even try to demonstrate actual damages. Additionally, the
5 Court notes that Plaintiff has not shown that any of the Defendants is responsible for the “seed”
6 file that provided Plaintiff’s copyrighted work on the BitTorrent network, and Plaintiff has not
7 presented evidence that Defendants profited from the infringement. More importantly, the Ninth
8 Circuit has determined that holding Defendants jointly and severally liable for a single award of
9 \$750 is proper. *LHF Prods. Inc. v. Doe 1*, ___ F. App’x ___, 2018 WL 3017156 (9th Cir. June
10 18, 2018).³

11
12 iii. *Attorneys’ Fees and Costs*

13 Finally, Plaintiff asks the Court to award \$1,069.50 in attorneys’ fees and between \$110
14 and \$160 in costs against Defendants individually. Dkt. #57-1 at ¶¶ 11–14. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C.
15 § 505, the Court “in its discretion may allow the recovery of full costs by or against any party,”
16 and “may also award a reasonable attorney’s fee to the prevailing party as part of the costs.”
17

18 The Court agrees that Plaintiff should be awarded attorneys’ fees. Courts consider several
19 factors, including “(1) the degree of success obtained, (2) frivolousness, (3) motivation, (4)
20 objective unreasonableness (legal and factual), and (5) the need to advance considerations of
21 compensation and deterrence,” when making attorneys’ fee determinations under the Copyright
22 Act. *Smith v. Jackson*, 84 F.3d 1213, 1221 (9th Cir. 1996) (citing *Jackson v. Axton*, 25 F.3d 884,
23 890 (9th Cir. 1994)). Because Plaintiff has succeeded on its non-frivolous claims, and because
24
25

26

³ The Ninth Circuit’s Memorandum decision applied to Ninth Circuit Case Nos. 17-35237; 17-35243; 17-35249; 17-35250; and 17-35253.

1 an award would advance considerations of compensation and deterrence, Plaintiff is entitled to
2 attorneys' fees.

3 However, Plaintiff's attorneys' fees request is problematic. Courts determine fee award
4 amounts by first determining a "lodestar figure," which is obtained by multiplying the number
5 of hours reasonably expended on a matter by the reasonable hourly rate. *Intel Corp. v. Terabyte*
6 *Int'l, Inc.*, 6 F.3d 614, 622 (9th Cir. 1993). Courts may then adjust the lodestar with reference to
7 factors set forth in *Kerr v. Screen Extras Guild, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 67, 69–70 (9th Cir. 1975). The
8 relevant *Kerr* factors here are: (1) the time and labor required; (2) the novelty and difficulty of
9 the questions; and (3) the skill requisite to perform the legal services properly. "The lodestar
10 amount presumably reflects the novelty and complexity of the issues, the special skill and
11 experience of counsel, the quality of representation, and the results obtained from the litigation."
12 *Intel*, 6 F.3d at 622. Given the nature of the work done by Plaintiff's counsel, Mr. Lowe, the
13 Court does not find Plaintiff's requested hourly rate, or the number of hours requested, to be
14 reasonable.
15

16 17 1. *Reasonableness of Rate Requested*

18 In the Ninth Circuit, the determination of a reasonable hourly rate "is not made by
19 reference to rates actually charged the prevailing party." *Chalmers v. City of Los Angeles*, 796
20 F.2d 1205 (9th Cir. 1986). Instead, the reasonable hourly rate is determined with reference to
21 the prevailing rates charged by attorneys of comparable skill and experience in the relevant
22 community. *See Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 895 (1984). "Generally, when determining a
23 reasonable hourly rate, the relevant community is the forum in which the district court sits."
24 *Camacho v. Bridgeport Fin., Inc.*, 523 F.3d 973, 979 (9th Cir. 2008). Courts may also consider
25 "rate determinations in other cases, particularly those setting a rate for the plaintiffs' attorney"
26

1 as “satisfactory evidence of the prevailing market rate.” *United Steelworkers of Am. v. Phelps*
2 *Dodge Corp.*, 896 F.2d 403, 407 (9th Cir. 1990).

3 Plaintiff argues that \$450 is a reasonable rate for “non-formulaic legal work”⁴ but requests
4 \$350 for Mr. Lowe’s routine work. Dkt. #55 at 5–6. However, similar cases in this District
5 suggest that a lower rate is appropriate. *See Qotd Film*, 2016 WL 5817027 at *3-4 (refusing to
6 award requested rate of \$450 where Mr. Lowe did not present evidence that this was prevailing
7 community rate). Notably, in two unrelated BitTorrent cases litigated by Mr. Lowe, this Court
8 has awarded Mr. Lowe a rate of \$350 and \$300 for work similar, if not identical, to the work
9 done in this matter. *See Id.* (finding an hourly rate of \$350 to be reasonable for Mr. Lowe’s work
10 in a nearly identical case); *also Dallas Buyers Club, LLC v. Nydam, et al.*,⁵ 2016 WL 7719874,
11 at *5-6 (W.D. Wash. August 8, 2016) (finding an hourly rate of \$300 to be reasonable for Mr.
12 Lowe’s work in a nearly identical case). In *Dallas Buyers Club*, the Court reasoned that an hourly
13 rate of \$300 is far more appropriate because the cases litigated by Mr. Lowe did not require
14 extensive skill or experience. *Id.* at *6. Indeed, it appears that in litigating *Dallas Buyers Club*,
15 Mr. Lowe—similar to his actions in this case—recycled pleadings used in other cases and
16 encountered little or no opposition from the named Defendants. *Id.* Given that Mr. Lowe’s work
17 in this matter amounts to nothing more than form pleading, the Court adopts the reasoning of
18 other BitTorrent cases in this District and will reduce Mr. Lowe’s hourly rate to \$300.
19

20
21 An hourly rate of \$300 is also reasonable in this case as it is consistent with the hourly
22 rate the Court found appropriate in Plaintiff’s related cases. *See* C16-551RSM, Dkt. #70; C16-
23

24 ⁴ Interestingly, Mr. Lowe does not claim to have performed any “non-formulaic legal work” in
25 this case and the argument is just a holdover from Mr. Lowe’s other form documents. *See* Dkt.
26 #57-1 (only utilizing a billing rate of \$350).

⁵ The Court entered a single order for related case Nos.: C14-1684RAJ; C14-1926RAJ; C15-133RAJ; C15-576RAJ; C15-579RAJ; C15-581RAJ; and C15-582RAJ.

1 1017RSM, Dkt. #78. More importantly, the Ninth Circuit has affirmed this Court’s
2 determination that \$300 represents a reasonable hourly rate for the work performed by Mr. Lowe
3 in identical cases.⁶ *LHF Prods. Inc.*, 2018 WL 3017156 at *1–2.

4 2. Reasonableness of Hours Requested

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

14
15 Mr. Lowe requests an unreasonable number of hours. In support of his attorneys’ fees
16 request, Mr. Lowe submits a declaration requesting compensation for 2.6 hours he allegedly spent
17 on work related to each Defendant. Dkt. #57-1 at ¶ 11. Mr. Lowe also requests fees for the time
18 his legal assistant spent on each Defendant’s case (at an hourly rate of \$145). Dkt. #57-1 at ¶ 11.
19 But Mr. Lowe’s activity within this District underscores the unreasonableness of this request.
20
21
22
23
24

25 ⁶ Mr. Lowe points to recent surveys of average billing rates to argue that a higher rate is
26 reasonable. Dkt. #57-1 at ¶ 7. But these general sources are not inconsistent with the Court’s
earlier findings that \$300 is a reasonable hourly rate, within this District, for the type of work
performed in these cases. Nor is the Court persuaded that it should utilize two different rates
depending on the “formulaic” nature of the work performed. Dkt. #57-1 at ¶ 8.

1 Since April 2016, Mr. Lowe has represented Plaintiff in eighteen cases against hundreds
2 of Doe Defendants.⁷ These cases have all proceeded in a similar manner. Each of the complaints
3 originally filed in these eighteen cases lists Doe Defendants, identified only by IP addresses, and
4 alleges infringement of Plaintiff’s exclusive rights in the motion picture *London Has Fallen*.
5 Groups of Doe Defendants are named in the same complaint because they allegedly infringed the
6 same digital copy of *London Has Fallen* by participating in the same BitTorrent “swarm.” After
7 nearly identical complaints were filed, Plaintiff, in all eighteen cases, filed nearly identical
8 motions for expedited discovery. Once the Court granted Plaintiff’s motions for expedited
9 discovery, Plaintiff then served subpoenas on the ISPs associated with each Doe Defendant’s IP
10 address. Once the ISPs provided Plaintiff with the Doe Defendants’ identities, Plaintiff filed
11 amended complaints. Except for the paragraphs identifying the Doe Defendants, all of the
12 amended complaints are identical. In all, Plaintiff has named 185 defendants.

14 After amending its complaints, Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed claims against some named
15 defendants—presumably because they paid Plaintiff some sum. If a claim is not settled, Plaintiff
16 continues to pursue its claim against the named defendants. Many of the remaining defendants
17 as in this case, have not answered Plaintiff’s amended complaints. A named defendant’s failure
18 to respond to Plaintiff’s amended complaints then prompts Plaintiff to file a motion for default.
19 To date the Court has granted ninety of Plaintiff’s motions for default in seventeen of Plaintiff’s
20 eighteen cases. Except for the captions, the motions for default are generally identical. After the
21 Court grants Plaintiff’s motions for default, Plaintiff files nearly identical motions for default
22 judgment.
23
24

25 ⁷ See Case Nos. C16-551RSM, C16-552RSM, C16-621RSM, C16-623RSM, C16-731RSM,
26 C16-864RSM, C16-865RSM, C16-1015RSM, C16-1017RSM, C16-1089RSM, C16-1090RSM,
C16-1175RSM, C16-1273RSM, C16-1354RSM, C16-1588RSM, C16-1648RSM, C17-
254RSM, and C17-782RSM.

1 While there is nothing wrong with Plaintiff’s filing of several infringement claims, it is
2 wrong for Plaintiff’s counsel to file identical complaints and motions with the Court and then
3 expect the Court to believe that it spent *hundreds* of hours preparing those same complaints and
4 motions. *See Malibu Media, LLC v. Schelling*, 31 F. Supp. 3d 910, 912-13 (E.D. Mich. 2014)
5 (“If Malibu Media is experiencing a massive invasion of infringers, it is entitled to seek redress
6 through the courts.”). As this Court has previously noted in a related case, it was not reasonable
7 for Mr. Lowe to assert that he spent 185 hours in preparing the filings for default judgments
8 against fifty-one named defendants when the filings were essentially the same. C16-551RSM,
9 Dkt. #70 at 12.

11 There is nothing unique, or complex, about engaging in what can only be described as
12 “the essence of form pleading,” and the Court will not condone unreasonable attorneys’ fees
13 requests. *Malibu*, 31 F. Supp. 3d at 912-13 (“[T]here is nothing unique about this case against
14 [defendant], it is quite a stretch to suggest that drafting and preparing the complaint for filing
15 took more than an hour, or that 1.3 hours were spent on drafting a motion for default judgment.”).
16 Further, the Court finds it hard to believe that Mr. Lowe spent significant amounts of time
17 preparing filings in this case and Plaintiff’s related cases as the filings are nearly identical to
18 filings Mr. Lowe has previously used in other unrelated cases. *See, e.g., QOTD Film Investment*
19 *Ltd. v. Doe 1 et al.*, Case Nos. C16-371RSL (W.D. Wash. 2016) and *Dallas Buyers Club, LLC*
20 *v. Does 1-10*, C14-1684RAJ (W.D. Wash. 2014).

22 Instead of awarding the unreasonable number of hours requested by Plaintiff, the Court
23 will award Mr. Lowe 2 hours, at an hourly rate of \$300, to compensate his firm for the time he
24 worked on the case against each Defendant.⁸ The Court will not award any of the time attributed
25

26 ⁸ The Court notes that a reduction in hours claimed is also appropriate as time appears inflated. Mr. Lowe filed motions for default in five of Plaintiff’s cases before this Court on the same day—

1 to Mr. Lowe’s legal assistant as review of the declaration submitted indicates that Mr. Lowe’s
2 legal assistant performed purely administrative tasks in this matter. Dkt. #57-1 at ¶ 11
3 (descriptions include “[p]repare waivers, request to waive summons and complaint exhibits, and
4 waivers . . . [r]eview and update docket regarding same” and “[p]repare summons . . . [r]eview
5 and update docket reminders regarding same”).

6 Accordingly, the Court has adjusted Plaintiff’s request of 2.6 hours to 2 hours at an hourly
7 rate of \$300. The Court is satisfied that an attorneys’ fee award of \$600 as to each Defendant is
8 reasonable and sufficient to cover Mr. Lowe’s form-pleading work in this case. The requested
9 costs from each named Defendant is also properly recovered in full.
10

11 IV. CONCLUSION

12 The Court, having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, finds
13 adequate bases for default judgment. Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS:

- 14 1. Plaintiff’s Motion for Default Judgment against Defendants (Dkt. #55) is GRANTED IN
15 PART.
- 16 2. Defendants are hereby permanently enjoined from directly, indirectly, or contributorily
17 infringing Plaintiff’s exclusive rights in the motion picture film *London Has Fallen*,
18 including without limitation by using the Internet to reproduce or copy *London Has*
19 *Fallen*, to distribute *London Has Fallen*, or to make *London Has Fallen* available for
20
21

22
23 July 2, 2018. See C16-551RSM, C16-1017RSM, C16-1089RSM, C16-1090RSM, and C16-
24 1588RSM. Combined, Plaintiff’s motions sought default judgment against 21 defendants. With
25 regard to each defendant, Mr. Lowe claims to have spent precisely 0.7 hours on the motions for
26 default on July 2, 2018—itself odd. See e.g., C16-1588RSM, Dkt. #61-1 at ¶ 11. Accordingly,
Mr. Lowe claims to have billed 14.7 hours on that day. While not outside the realm of possibility,
the Court has some concern as to the accuracy of this contention. Plaintiff’s last motion for
default judgment was filed at 7:14 p.m. on July 2, 2018. See C16-1588RSM, Dkt. #59. Thus,
giving Mr. Lowe the benefit of the doubt and assuming that he worked continuously and took no
breaks during the day, he began working at 4:32 a.m. While possible, the hours may be inflated.

1 distribution to the public, except pursuant to lawful written license or with the express
2 authority of Plaintiff.

3 3. To the extent any such material exists, Defendants are directed to destroy all unauthorized
4 copies of *London Has Fallen* in their possession or subject to their control.

5 4. Defendants are jointly and severally liable for statutory damages in the amount of
6 \$750.00.

7 5. Defendant Victor Rodriguez is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of
8 \$600.00 and costs in the amount of \$160.00.

9 6. Defendant Jason Stanfel is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of \$600.00
10 and costs in the amount of \$155.00.

11 7. Defendant Kimberly Barrett is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of
12 \$600.00 and costs in the amount of \$160.00.

13 8. Defendant Connie Pierre is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of
14 \$600.00 and costs in the amount of \$160.00.

15 9. Defendant Joyann Stone is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of \$600.00
16 and costs in the amount of \$110.00.

17 10. Defendant Amber McClean is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of
18 \$600.00 and costs in the amount of \$155.00.

19 11. Defendant Carmen Ifierro is individually liable for attorneys' fees in the amount of
20 \$600.00 and costs in the amount of \$155.00.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment consistent
2 with this Order.

3 DATED this 7 day of August, 2018.

4
5 

6 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
7 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26