

300 7501



Provided by:  
Overhauser Law Offices LLC  
www.iniplaw.org  
www.overhauser.com

FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
SOUTH BEND DIVISION

13 JUN 13 PM 12:00

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT  
OF INDIANA

COACH, INC. and COACH SERVICES, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DOWNTOWN GIFT SHOP and CHUN YING  
HUANG, individually and d/b/a DOWNTOWN  
GIFT SHOP,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:13CV 591

**ORIGINAL COMPLAINT**

Plaintiffs Coach, Inc. and Coach Services, Inc. (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Coach”), through their undersigned counsel, Locke Lord LLP, hereby file this Original Complaint against Defendants Downtown Gift Shop and Chun Ying Huang, individually and d/b/a Downtown Gift Shop (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants”) requesting damages and injunctive relief, and upon personal knowledge as to their own acts and circumstances, and upon information and belief as to the acts and circumstances of others, allege as follows:

Nature of the Action

1. This is an action for trademark infringement, false designation of origin and false advertising under the Lanham Act 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114, 1116, 1117, 1125(a) and (c); trademark infringement and unfair competition under the common law of the State of Indiana; and forgery

under Indiana Code § 35-43-5-2(b) as well as counterfeiting under Indiana Code § 35-43-5-2(a), pursuant to Indiana Code § 34-24-3-1.

### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

2. Jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter of this action is proper in this Court pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1121 (actions arising under the Lanham Act), 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (actions arising under the laws of the United States), 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) (diversity of citizenship between the parties), and § 1338(a) (actions arising under an Act of Congress relating to copyrights and trademarks). This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the claims in this Complaint that arise under state statutory and common law pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants because they do business and/or reside in the State of Indiana.

4. Venue is properly founded in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) and 1400 (b) because Defendants reside in this District, may be found in this District, and/or a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims in this action occurred within this District.

### **Parties**

5. Plaintiff Coach, Inc. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland, with its principal place of business in New York, New York.

6. Plaintiff Coach Services, Inc. is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland with its principal place of business in Jacksonville, Florida.

7. Upon information and belief, Defendant Downtown Gift Shop is a domestic entity operating a business under the assumed name Downtown Gift Shop at 713 West McKinley, Mishawaka, Indiana, and also has its principal place of business in Indiana.

8. Upon information and belief, Defendant Chun Ying Huang, is an individual residing in Granger, St. Joseph County, Indiana.

9. Upon information and belief, Chun Ying Huang is an agent of Downtown Gift Shop.

10. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that at all relevant times herein, Defendants knew or reasonably should have known of the acts and behavior alleged herein and the damages caused thereby, and by their inaction ratified and encouraged such acts and behavior.

11. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants have a non-delegable duty to prevent or cause such acts and the behavior described herein, which duty Defendants failed and/or refused to perform.

12. Upon information and belief, Defendant Chun Ying Huang is an individual who has been doing business in her individual capacity and as the owner and/or operator of or in concert with, inter alia, Downtown Gift Shop, and is individually liable for the infringing activities described herein.

13. At all relevant times Defendant Chun Ying Huang personally participated in and/or had the ability and right to supervise, direct, and control the infringing activities occurring at Downtown Gift Shop and alleged in this Complaint.

14. Upon information and belief, Defendant Chun Ying Huang derived direct financial benefits from the infringing activities alleged herein. As a result, Defendant Chun Ying Huang is liable individually, contributorily and vicariously to Coach for the infringing activities alleged herein and that was occurring at Downtown Gift Shop.

**The World Famous Coach Brand and Products**

15. Coach was founded more than seventy (70) years ago as a family-run workshop in Manhattan. Since then Coach has been engaged in the manufacture, marketing and sale of fine leather and mixed material products including handbags, wallets, and accessories including eyewear, footwear including shoes, jewelry and watches. Coach sells its goods through its own specialty retail stores, department stores, catalogs and via an Internet website [www.coach.com](http://www.coach.com) throughout the United States, including Indiana.






16. Coach has used a variety of legally-protected trademarks for many years on and in connection with the advertisement and sale of its products, including, but not limited to those detailed in paragraphs \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ of this Complaint (collectively, the “Coach Marks”).







17. Coach has expended substantial time, money, and other resources in developing, advertising, and otherwise promoting the Coach Marks. As a result, products bearing the Coach Marks are widely recognized and exclusively associated by consumers, the public, and the trade as being high quality products sourced from Coach, and have acquired strong secondary meaning. Coach products have also become among the most popular in the world, with Coach’s annual global sales currently exceeding three billion dollars. Coach continues to invest substantial sums in promoting its products and services offered under the Coach Marks.







**The Coach Trademarks**

18. Coach is the owner of the following United States Federal Trademark Registrations (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Coach Trademarks”):









<u>Registration No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Classes</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>	<u>Image</u>
2,088,706	COACH	6, 9, 16, 18, 20 and 25 for <i>inter alia</i> key fobs, eyeglass cases, satchels, tags for luggage, luggage, backpacks, picture frames, hats, gloves and caps.	September 19, 1997	COACH
3,157,972	COACH	35 for retail store services.	October 17, 2006	COACH
0,751,493	COACH	16, 18 for <i>inter alia</i> leather goods, wallets and billfolds.	June 23, 1963	COACH
2,451,168	COACH	9 for <i>inter alia</i> eyeglasses and sunglass Cases	May 15, 2001	COACH
2,537,004	COACH	24 for <i>inter alia</i> home furnishings.	February 5, 2002	COACH
1,846,801	COACH	25 for <i>inter alia</i> men's and women's coats and jackets.	July 26, 1994	COACH
3,439,871	COACH	18 for <i>inter alia</i> umbrellas.	June 3, 2008	COACH
2,061,826	COACH	12 for <i>inter alia</i> seat covers.	May 13, 1997	COACH
2,231,001	COACH	25 for <i>inter alia</i> men and women's clothing.	March 9, 1999	COACH
2,836,172	COACH	14 for <i>inter alia</i> sporting goods and stuffed toys.	April 27, 2004	COACH
2,939,127	COACH	9 for <i>inter alia</i> camera cases.	April 12, 2005	COACH
3,354,448	COACH	14 for <i>inter alia</i> jewelry.	December 11, 2007	COACH


<u>Registration No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Classes</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>	<u>Image</u>
2,446,607	COACH	16 for <i>inter alia</i> writing instruments.	April 24, 2001	COACH
2,291,341	COACH	14 for <i>inter alia</i> clocks and watches.	November 9, 1999	COACH
1,071,000	COACH	18, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> women's handbags.	August 9, 1977	COACH
3,633,302	COACH	3 for <i>inter alia</i> perfumes, lotions and body sprays.	June 2, 2009	COACH
3,908,558	POPPY	09 for eyeglasses and sunglasses.	January 18, 2011	POPPY
3,812,170	POPPY	18 for <i>inter alia</i> backpacks, briefcases, leather key chains, bags, wallets and billfolds.	June 29, 2010	POPPY
2,534,429	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	9 for <i>inter alia</i> eyeglasses, eyeglass frames and sunglasses.	January 29, 2002	
3,363,873	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	3 for <i>inter alia</i> fragrances.	January 1, 2008	
2,252,847	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	35 retail services.	June 15, 1999	
2,291,368	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	14 for <i>inter alia</i> jewelry.	November 9, 1999	
2,534,429	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	9 for <i>inter alia</i> eyeglasses, eyeglass frames and sunglasses.	January 29, 2002	

<u>Registration No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Classes</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>	<u>Image</u>
2,169,808	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	25 for <i>inter alia</i> clothing for men and women.	June 30, 1998	
2,045,676	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	6, 9, 16, 18, 20, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> key fobs, money clips, phone cases, attaché cases, duffel bags, picture frames, hats, caps and gloves.	March 18, 1997	
1,070,999	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	18, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> women's handbags.	August 9, 1977	
1,309,779	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	9, 16, 18 for <i>inter alia</i> eyeglass cases and leather goods such as wallets, handbags and shoulder bags.	December 19, 1984	
2,035,056	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	3, 21 for <i>inter alia</i> leather cleaning products and shoe brushes.	February 4, 1997	
2,983,654	COACH & LOZENGE DESIGN	18, 24, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> handbags, leather goods, fabrics, swimwear, hats and shoes.	August 9, 2005	
2,626,565	CC & DESIGN (Signature C)	18 for <i>inter alia</i> handbags, purses, clutches, shoulder bags, tote bags, and wallets.	September 24, 2002	
2,822,318	CC & DESIGN (Signature C)	24 for <i>inter alia</i> fabric for use in the manufacture of clothing, shoes, handbags, and luggage.	March 16, 2004	

<u>Registration No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Classes</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>	<u>Image</u>
2,832,589	CC & DESIGN (Signature C)	14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 4, 6, 9 for <i>inter alia</i> sunglasses and eye glass cases, leather goods,	April 13, 2004	
2,592,963	CC & DESIGN (Signature C)	25 for <i>inter alia</i> clothing.	July 9, 2002	
2,822,629	CC & DESIGN (Signature C)	35 for retail services for <i>inter alia</i> handbags, small leather goods, jewelry and watches.	March 16, 2004	
3,012,585	AMENDED CC & DESIGN (Signature C)	18, 24, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> handbags, purses, fabrics and clothing.	November 8, 2005	
3,396,554	AMENDED CC & DESIGN (Signature C)	3 for <i>inter alia</i> fragrances.	March 11, 2008	
3,784,814	COACH OP ART	9 for eyeglasses and sunglasses.	May 4, 2010	
3,779,466	COACH OP ART	6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> key fobs, glasses, jewelry, daily planners, backpacks, billfolds, and belts.	April 20, 2010	COACH OP ART



<u>Registration No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Classes</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>	<u>Image</u>
3,696,470	COACH OP ART & DESIGN	18, 24 and 25 for <i>inter alia</i> bags, umbrellas, shoes and the manufacture of these goods.	October 13, 2009	
3,251,315	COACH EST. 1941	18, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> handbags, small leather goods, jackets and coats.	June 12, 2007	
3,413,536	COACH EST. 1941 STYLIZED	14, 18, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> handbags, purses, shoulder bags, tote bags, and wallets.	April 15, 2008	
3,441,671	COACH LEATHERWARE EST. 1941 [Heritage Logo]	9, 14, 18, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> handbags, leather cases, purses, and wallets.	June 3, 2008	
1,664,527	THE COACH FACTORY STORE & LOZENGE DESIGN	42 for <i>inter alia</i> retail services for leather ware.	November 12, 1991	
3,338,048	COACH STYLIZED	18 for <i>inter alia</i> luggage, backpacks and shoulder bags	November 11, 2007	
3,149,330	C & LOZENGE LOGO	9, 14, 16, 25 for <i>inter alia</i> desk accessories, clothing and eye glasses.	September 26, 2006	
2,162,303	COACH & TAG DESIGN	25 for <i>inter alia</i> clothing.	June 2, 1998	

<u>Registration No.</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Classes</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>	<u>Image</u>
2,088,707	COACH & TAG DESIGN	18 for <i>inter alia</i> accessory cases, backpacks and satchels.	August 19, 1997	

19. These registrations<sup>1</sup> are valid, subsisting, in full force and effect, and have become incontestable pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1065.

20. The registration of the marks constitutes prima facie evidence of their validity and conclusive evidence of Coach's exclusive right to use the Coach Trademarks in connection with the goods identified therein and other commercial goods.

21. The registration of the marks also provides sufficient notice to Defendants of Coach's ownership and exclusive rights in the Coach Trademarks.

22. The Coach Trademarks qualify as famous marks, as that term is used in 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (c)(1).

23. The Coach Trademarks have been continuously used and have never been abandoned.

24. As a result of extensive use and promotion, the Coach Trademarks have acquired a favorable reputation to consumers as an identifier and symbol of Coach and its products, services, and goodwill. Accordingly, Coach is the owner of broad common-law and federal trademark rights in the Coach Trademarks.

**Defendants' Acts of Infringement and Unfair Competition**

25. Upon information and belief, Defendants are engaged in designing, manufacturing, advertising, promoting, distributing, selling, and/or offering for sale products

---

<sup>1</sup> All registrations originally held in the name of Coach's predecessors, Sara Lee Corporation and Saramar Corporation, were assigned in full to Coach on or about October 2, 2000.

bearing logos and source-identifying indicia and design elements that are studied imitations of the Coach Trademarks (hereinafter referred to as the “Infringing Products”). Defendants’ specific conduct includes, among other things:

26. Defendants traffic in Infringing Products, including but not limited to, counterfeit Coach handbags, wallets, scarves, sunglasses, jewelry, and hats at Downtown Gift Shop in Mishawaka, Indiana as an enticement to attract potential customers to the business.

27. On December 8, 2012, a private investigator from Coach visited the Downtown Gift Shop at 713 West McKinley, Mishawaka, Indiana, and observed thousands of trademarked handbags, boots, and accessories, amongst others, displayed for sale. These items had trademarks for many high-end brands including, but not limited to, Coach, Louis Vuitton, Chanel, Tory Burch, Burberry, Tiffany, UGG, and NorthFace.

28. The investigator purchased several trademarked items and provided information regarding the purchase and the investigation to the St. Joseph County Police Department.

29. On December 11, 2012, investigators from Coach accompanied officers from the St. Joseph County Police Department, Indiana State Police Department, and the Department of Homeland Security, to execute a search warrant on Downtown Gift Shop.

30. The officers identified the owner of the store who was present when the officers executed the search warrant as a Ms. Chun Ying Huang.

31. The investigators and officers identified, photographed, and seized over three thousand (3,000) counterfeit trademarked merchandize, including over one-thousand (1,000) Coach handbags, wallets, scarves, sunglasses, jewelry, and hats.

32. The seized items are all counterfeit.

33. Defendants are not, and never have been, authorized retailers of Coach merchandise.

34. Upon information and belief, Defendant Chun Ying Huang contributed to these infringing acts by Downtown Gift Shop to sell and distribute counterfeit Coach products on the premises.

35. Upon information and belief, Defendant Chun Ying Huang was aware, or should have been aware, or was willfully blind to these infringing activities. Further, Defendant Chun Ying Huang had an obligation and ability to control and stop these infringements, but failed to do so.

36. Indeed, Defendant Chun Ying Huang did not want the infringement to stop as, upon information and belief, she received direct financial benefits from the infringement. These acts and failures to act by Defendant Chun Ying Huang materially contributed to the infringement.

37. Each of the Defendants are well aware of the extraordinary fame and strength of the Coach Brand, the Coach Trademarks, and the Coach Marks, and the incalculable goodwill associated therewith.

38. Defendants have no license, authority, or other permission from Coach to use any of the Coach Trademarks or the Coach Marks in connection with the designing, manufacturing, advertising, promoting, distributing, selling, and/or offering for sale of the Infringing Products.

39. Defendants have been engaging in the above-described illegal counterfeiting and infringing activities knowingly and intentionally or with reckless disregard or willful blindness to Coach's rights, or with bad faith, for the purpose of trading on the goodwill and reputation of the Coach Marks and Coach products.

40. Defendants' activities, as described above, are likely to create a false impression and deceive consumers, the public, and the trade into believing that there is a connection or association between the Infringing Products and Coach.

41. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to continue to design, manufacture, advertise, promote, import, distribute, sell, and/or offer for sale the Infringing Products, unless otherwise restrained.

42. Coach is suffering irreparable injury, has suffered substantial damages as a result of Defendants' activities, and has no adequate remedy at law.

**COUNT I**  
**(Trademark Counterfeiting, 15 U.S.C. § 1114)**

43. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

44. Defendants, without authorization from Coach, have used and are continuing to use spurious designations that are identical to, or substantially indistinguishable from, the Coach's Trademarks.

45. The foregoing acts of Defendants are intended to cause, have caused, and are likely to continue to cause confusion or mistake, or to deceive consumers, the public, and the trade into believing that Defendants' Infringing Products are genuine or authorized products of Coach.

46. Upon information and belief, Defendants have acted with knowledge of Coach's ownership of the Coach Trademarks and with deliberate intention or willful blindness to unfairly benefit from the incalculable goodwill inherent in the Coach Marks.

47. Defendants' acts constitute trademark counterfeiting in violation of Section 32 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1114).

48. Upon information and belief, Defendants have made and will continue to make substantial profits and gains to which they are not in law or equity entitled.

49. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to continue their infringing acts, unless restrained by this Court.

50. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Coach, and Coach has no adequate remedy at law.

**COUNT II**  
**(Trademark Infringement, 15 U.S.C. § 1114)**

51. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

52. Defendants, without authorization from Coach, have used and are continuing to use spurious designations that are confusingly similar to Coach's Trademarks.

53. The foregoing acts of Defendants are intended to cause, have caused, and are likely to continue to cause confusion, mistake, and deception among consumers, the public, and the trade as to whether Defendants' Infringing Products originate from, or are affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by Coach.

54. Upon information and belief, Defendants have acted with knowledge of Coach's ownership of the Coach Trademarks and with deliberate intention or willful blindness to unfairly benefit from the incalculable goodwill symbolized thereby.

55. Defendants' acts constitute trademark infringement in violation of Section 32 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1114).

56. Upon information and belief, Defendants have made and will continue to make substantial profits and gains to which they are not in law or equity entitled.

57. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to continue their infringing acts, unless restrained by this Court.

58. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Coach, and Coach has no adequate remedy at law.

**COUNT III**  
**(False Designation of Origin and False Advertising, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))**

59. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

60. Defendants' promotion, advertising, distribution, sale, and/or offering for sale of the Infringing Products, together with Defendants' use of other indicia associated with Coach is intended, and is likely to confuse, mislead, or deceive consumers, the public, and the trade as to the origin, source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the Infringing Products, and is intended, and is likely to cause such parties to believe in error that the Infringing Products have been authorized, sponsored, approved, endorsed or licensed by Coach, or that Defendants are in some way affiliated with Coach.

61. The foregoing acts of Defendants constitute a false designation of origin, and false and misleading descriptions and representations of fact, all in violation of Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)).

62. Upon information and belief, Defendants have made and will continue to make substantial profits and gains to which they are not in law or equity entitled.

63. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to continue their infringing acts, unless restrained by this Court.

64. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Coach, and Coach has no adequate remedy at law.

**COUNT IV**  
**(Common Law Trademark Infringement)**

65. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

66. Coach owns all rights, title, and interest in and to the Coach Trademarks, including all common law rights in such marks.

67. Defendants, without authorization from Coach, have used and are continuing to use spurious designations that are confusingly similar to the Coach Trademarks.

68. The foregoing acts of Defendants are intended to cause, have caused, and are likely to continue to cause confusion, mistake, and deception among consumers, the public, and the trade as to whether Defendants' Infringing Products originate from, or are affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by Coach.

69. Upon information and belief, Defendants have acted with knowledge of Coach's ownership of the Coach Trademarks and with deliberate intention or willful blindness to unfairly benefit from the incalculable goodwill symbolized thereby.

70. Defendants' acts constitute trademark infringement in violation of the common law of the State of Indiana.

71. Upon information and belief, Defendants have made and will continue to make substantial profits and gains to which they are not in law or equity entitled.

72. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to continue their infringing acts, unless restrained by this Court.

73. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Coach, and Coach has no adequate remedy at law.



**COUNT VII**  
**(Common Law Unfair Competition)**

74. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

75. The foregoing acts of Defendants permit Defendants to use and benefit from the goodwill and reputation earned by Coach and to obtain a ready customer acceptance of Defendants' products, and constitute unfair competition, palming off, and misappropriation in violation of Indiana common law, for which Coach is entitled to recover any and all remedies provided by such common law.

76. Upon information and belief, Defendants have made and will continue to make substantial profits and gains to which they are not in law or equity entitled.

77. Upon information and belief, Defendants intend to continue their infringing acts, unless restrained by this Court.

78. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Coach, and Coach has no adequate remedy at law.

**COUNT VIII**  
**(Forgery Under Ind. Code § 35-43-5-2(b))**

79. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

80. Defendant, with the intent to defraud, made and/or possessed and/or disseminated written instrument, namely the marks on the Infringing Products, in such a manner that they purported (and purport) to have been made by Coach.

81. Coach did not give Defendants the authority to make or possess or disseminate the Infringing Products and/or the marks contained thereon or on their packaging.

82. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Coach, and Coach has no adequate remedy at law.

83. In addition to the injunctive relief, Coach also seeks an award of actual damages, treble damages, costs and attorney's fees, pursuant to the Indiana Crime Victims Act, Indiana Code § 34-24-3-1, for pecuniary losses resulting from Defendants' forgery even though monetary damages alone are inadequate to fully compensate Coach for Defendants' conduct.

**COUNT IX**  
**(Counterfeiting Under Ind. Code § 35-43-5-2(a))**

84. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

85. Defendants, knowingly or intentionally made and/or disseminated written instruments, namely the marks on the Infringing Products, in such a manner that they purported (and purport) to have been made by Coach.

86. Coach did not give Defendants the authority to make or disseminate the Infringing Products and/or the marks contained thereon or on their packaging.

87. Defendants' acts have damaged and will continue to damage Coach, and Coach has no adequate remedy at law.

88. In addition to injunctive relief, Coach also seeks an award of actual damages, treble damages, costs and attorney's fees, pursuant to the Indiana Crime Victim's Act, Indiana Code § 34-24-3-1, for pecuniary losses resulting from Defendants' counterfeiting even though monetary damages alone are inadequate to fully compensate Coach for Defendants' conduct.

**COUNT X**  
**(Common Law Unjust Enrichment)**

89. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

90. By reason of the foregoing, Defendants have unjustly enriched themselves, and continue to do so, in an unknown amount.

91. Coach is entitled to just compensation under the common law of the State of Indiana.

**COUNT XI**  
**(Attorneys' Fees)**

92. Coach repeats and realleges the allegations set forth above as if fully set forth herein.

93. Coach is also entitled to an award of attorneys' fees and costs under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a).

94. Coach is also entitled to an award of attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to the Indiana Crime Victim's Act, Indiana Code § 34-24-3-1.

**PRAYER**

**WHEREFORE**, Coach respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment against Defendants as follows:

(a) Finding that:

- (1) Defendants have violated Section 32 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1114); Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)); and Section 43(c) of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1125(c));
- (2) Defendants have engaged in trademark infringement and unfair competition under the common law of Indiana;
- (3) Defendants have committed forgery and counterfeiting under Indiana's criminal statutes and such conduct has damaged Coach monetarily and in ways not adequately remedied by monetary damages alone; and

(4) Defendants have been unjustly enriched in violation of Indiana common law.

(b) Granting an injunction, pursuant to Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 15 U.S.C. § 1116, preliminarily and permanently restraining and enjoining Defendants, their officers, agents, employees, and attorneys, and all those persons or entities in active concert or participation with them from:

- (1) manufacturing, importing, advertising, marketing, promoting, supplying, distributing, offering for sale, or selling any products which bear the Coach Trademarks, or any other mark or design element substantially similar or confusing thereto, including, without limitation, the Infringing Products, and engaging in any other activity constituting an infringement of any of Coach's rights in the Coach Trademarks;
- (2) engaging in any other activity constituting unfair competition with Coach, or acts and practices that deceive consumers, the public, and/or trade, including without limitation, the use of designations and design elements associated with Coach; and
- (3) engaging in any other activity that will cause the distinctiveness of the Coach Trademarks to be diluted.

(c) Requiring Defendants to recall from any distributors and retailers and to deliver to Coach for destruction or other disposition all remaining inventory of

all Infringing Products, including all advertisements, promotional and marketing materials therefore, as well as means of making same;

- (d) Requiring Defendants to file with this Court and serve on Coach within thirty (30) days after entry of the injunction a report in writing under oath setting forth in detail the manner and form in which Defendants have complied with the injunction;
- (e) Directing such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate to prevent consumers, the public, and/or the trade from deriving any erroneous impression that any product at issue in this action that has been manufactured, imported, advertised, marketed, promoted, supplied, distributed, offered for sale, or sold by Defendants, has been authorized by Coach, or is related in any way with Coach and/or its products;
- (f) Awarding Coach statutory damages of \$2,000,000 per counterfeit mark per type of good in accordance with Section 35 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1117) or alternatively, and at Coach's request, ordering Defendants to account to and pay to Coach all profits realized by their wrongful acts and also awarding Coach its actual damages, and also directing that such profits or actual damages be trebled, in accordance with Section 35 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1117);
- (g) Awarding Coach actual and punitive damages to which it is entitled under applicable federal and state laws;
- (h) Awarding Coach its costs, attorneys' fees, investigatory fees, and expenses to the full extent provided by Section 35 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1117);


- (i) Awarding Coach pre-judgment interest on any monetary award made part of the judgment against Defendants; and
- (j) Awarding Coach such additional and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

**DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Coach requests a trial by jury in this matter.

Dated: June 12, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Ginger L. Appleberry  
Texas Bar No. 24040442  
Donald A. Cole  
Illinois Bar No. 6299318  
LOCKE LORD LLP  
111 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 443-0323 (Telephone)  
(312) 896-6573 (Fax)

**COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS  
COACH, INC. and COACH SERVICES,  
INC.**