1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
7	VENICE PI, LLC,	
8	Plaintiff,	
9	V.	C17-1219 TSZ
10	CHRISTINA BRUMANN (formerly	MINUTE ORDER
11	known as Christina Bannon-Durant), Defendant.	
12		
13	The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge:	
14	(1) Plaintiff Venice PI, LLC's motion, docket no. 59, to dismiss its claims	
15	without prejudice is GRANTED. Plaintiff initiated this action against ten defendants	
16	"swarm" infringing plaintiff's copyrights in the motion picture "Once Upon a Time in	
17	Venice." Christina Brumann is the sole remaining defendant. On April 22, 2019, plaintiff filed a notice of voluntary dismissal, docket no. 59, which the Court treated as a motion to diamias without projudice. See Minute Order (docket no. 60). Prymern has	
18	motion to dismiss without prejudice. <u>See</u> Minute Order (docket no. 60). Brumann has responded and requested that the Court dismiss plaintiff's claims against her with prejudice and award her attorney's fees under the Copyright Act in an amount to be	
19	determined later. Under the Copyright Act, attorney's fees are discretionary, and the Court can decline to award them. <u>See Killer Joe Nevada, LLC v. Does 1-20</u> , 807 F.3d	
20	908, 911 (8th Cir. 2015); <u>Palladium Music, Inc. v. EatSleepMusic, Inc.</u> , 398 F.3d 1193, 1200-01 (10th Cir. 2005); <u>see also Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.</u> , 510 U.S. 517, 534 n.19	
21	(1994) (setting forth the following nonexclusive factors: frivolousness, motivation, objective unreasonableness (both in the factual and in the legal components of the case)	
22		
23	MINUTE ORDER - 1	

1	and the need in particular circumstances to advance considerations of compensation and		
	deterrence). When plaintiff filed this action, the law was unsettled, and the copyright		
2	infringement claim asserted by plaintiff was arguably "plausible." <u>See Bell Atl. Corp. v.</u> <u>Twombly</u> , 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). Even if the Court dismissed plaintiff's claims		
3	against Brumann with prejudice, the Court would not award Brumann attorney's fees under the Copyright Act. Thus, the prospect of attorney's fees is not a basis to dismiss this matter with prejudice. Brumann contends that, unless this action is dismissed with prejudice, she will live in fear of plaintiff filing another lawsuit against her. Brumann's concern should be alleviated by <u>Cobbler Nevada, LLC v. Gonzales</u> , 901 F.3d 1142 (9th Cir. 2018), which set forth a binding pleading standard for these types of cases. In the		
4			
5			
6	absence of "something more" than just an IP address as evidence, <u>see id.</u> at 1145, any renewed pursuit of copyright infringement claims against Brumann might constitute the		
7	type of bad faith and vexatious conduct that could subject plaintiff and/or its attorney to sanctions under the Court's inherent power and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1927. <u>See Chambers v.</u> <u>NASCO, Inc.</u> , 501 U.S. 32 (1991); <u>B.K.B. v. Maui Police Dep't</u> , 276 F.3d 1091, 1106-09 (9th Cir. 2002).		
8			
9	(2) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Minute Order to all counsel of		
10	record and to CLOSE this case.		
11	Dated this 17th day of June, 2019.		
12	William M. McCool		
13	Clerk		
14	s/Karen Dews		
	Deputy Clerk		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
22			
23			
	MINUTE ORDER - 2		