Case	1:15-cv-00615-WTL-DKL Document 1 File	d 04/17/15 Page 1 of 8 PageID #: 1	
1 2 3	United States District Court Southern District of Indiana Indianapolis Division		
4	G & G CLOSED CIRCUIT EVENTS, LLC,	Case No.: 15-cv-615	
5	Plaintiff,		
6		COMPLAINT	
7	VS.		
8	ZEFERINO ALVAREZ, INDIVIDUALLY and d/b/a EL BOHEMIO BAR; and SABOR		
9	BOHEMIO, LLC, an unknown business entity d/b/a EL BOHEMIO BAR,		
10			
11	Defendants.		
12		-	
13	PLAINTIFF ALLEGES:		
14	JURISDICTION		
15			
	1. Jurisdiction is founded on the existence of	a question arising under particular statutes. This	
16		a question ansing under particular statutes. This	
16 17	action is brought pursuant to several federal statu	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934,	
	action is brought pursuant to several federal statu as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i> , and Th	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and	
17	action is brought pursuant to several federal statu as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i> , and Th Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U.	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and	
17 18	action is brought pursuant to several federal statu as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i> , and Th Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U.	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and	
17 18 19	action is brought pursuant to several federal statu as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i> , and Th Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U.	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> ct matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.	
17 18 19 20	 action is brought pursuant to several federal statut as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i>, and The Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U. 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject 	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> ct matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. rts shall original jurisdiction of all civil actions	
17 18 19 20 21	 action is brought pursuant to several federal statut as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i>, and The Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U. 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject Section 1331, which states that the District Court 	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> ct matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. rts shall original jurisdiction of all civil actions the United States. This Court has subject matter	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 	 action is brought pursuant to several federal statut as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i>, and The Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U. 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject Section 1331, which states that the District Court arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties, of jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 2 	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> ct matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. rts shall original jurisdiction of all civil actions the United States. This Court has subject matter 8 U.S.C. § 1367 (supplemental jurisdiction).	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	 action is brought pursuant to several federal statut as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i>, and The Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U. 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject Section 1331, which states that the District Court arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties, of jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 2 3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over 	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> ct matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. rts shall original jurisdiction of all civil actions The United States. This Court has subject matter 8 U.S.C. § 1367 (supplemental jurisdiction).	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	 action is brought pursuant to several federal statut as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i>, and The Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U. 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject Section 1331, which states that the District Court arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties, of jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 2 3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants' wrongful acts hereinafter complained 	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> ct matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. rts shall original jurisdiction of all civil actions The United States. This Court has subject matter 8 U.S.C. § 1367 (supplemental jurisdiction). er the parties in this action as a result of the d of which violated the Plaintiff's rights as the	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	 action is brought pursuant to several federal statur as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i>, and Th Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U. 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject Section 1331, which states that the District Court arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties, of jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 2 3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants' wrongful acts hereinafter complaine exclusive commercial domestic distributor of the 	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> ct matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. rts shall original jurisdiction of all civil actions The United States. This Court has subject matter 8 U.S.C. § 1367 (supplemental jurisdiction). er the parties in this action as a result of the d of which violated the Plaintiff's rights as the	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	 action is brought pursuant to several federal statur as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i>, and Th Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U. 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject Section 1331, which states that the District Court arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties, of jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 2 3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants' wrongful acts hereinafter complaine exclusive commercial domestic distributor of the 	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> et matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. rts shall original jurisdiction of all civil actions the United States. This Court has subject matter 8 U.S.C. § 1367 (supplemental jurisdiction). er the parties in this action as a result of the d of which violated the Plaintiff's rights as the televised fight <i>Program</i> hereinafter set forth at	
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 	 action is brought pursuant to several federal statur as amended, Title 47 U.S.C. 605, <i>et seq.</i>, and Th Competition Act of 1992, as amended, Title 47 U. 2. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject Section 1331, which states that the District Court arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties, of jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 2 3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants' wrongful acts hereinafter complaine exclusive commercial domestic distributor of the 	tes, including the Communications Act of 1934, e Cable & Television Consumer Protection and S. Section 553, <i>et seq.</i> et matter of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. rts shall original jurisdiction of all civil actions the United States. This Court has subject matter 8 U.S.C. § 1367 (supplemental jurisdiction). er the parties in this action as a result of the d of which violated the Plaintiff's rights as the televised fight <i>Program</i> hereinafter set forth at	

divulgence, display, exhibition, and tortious conversion of said property of Plaintiff within the 1 control of the Plaintiff in the State of Indiana. 2 3 <u>VENUE</u> 4 Pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. Section 605, venue is proper in the Southern District, because a 4. 5 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District. 6 7 INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT 8 5. Assignment to the Indianapolis Division of the Southern District is proper because a 9 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in Marion County 10 and/or the United States District Court for the Southern District has decided that suits of this 11 nature, and each of them, are to be heard by the Courts in this particular Division. 12 13 **THE PARTIES** 6. Plaintiff, G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC is, and at all relevant times mentioned was, a 14 California corporation with its principal place of liquor located at 2380 South Bascom Avenue, 15 Suite 200, Campbell, California 95008. 16 17 Defendant Zeferino Alvarez is an officer of Sabor Bohemio, LLC, which owns and 7. 18 operates the commercial establishment doing business as El Bohemio Bar. El Bohemio Bar 19 operates at 4002 East Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46201. 20 8. Defendant Zeferino Alvarez is also an individual specifically identified by the Department of Liquor License issued for El Bohemio Bar (License # RR4921637). 21 22 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and alleges thereon that on April 20, 2013(the night of 23 the Program at issue herein, as more specifically defined in paragraph 16), Defendant Zeferino 24 Alvarez had the right and ability to supervise the activities of El Bohemio Bar, which included the 25 unlawful interception of Plaintiff's Program. 26 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and alleges thereon that on April 20, 2013 (the night of 27 the Program at issue herein, as more specifically defined in paragraph 16), Defendant Zeferino 28

Alvarez, as an individual specifically identified on the liquor license for El Bohemio Bar, had the obligation to supervise the activities of El Bohemio Bar, which included the unlawful interception of Plaintiff's *Program*, and, among other responsibilities, had the obligation to ensure that the liquor license was not used in violation of law.

4

1

2

3

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and alleges thereon that on April 20, 2013 (the night of
the *Program* at issue herein, as more specifically defined in paragraph 16), Defendant Zeferino
Alvarez specifically directed the employees of El Bohemio Bar to unlawfully intercept and
broadcast Plaintiff's *Program* at El Bohemio Bar or that the actions of the employees of El
Bohemio Bar are directly imputable to Defendants Zeferino Alvarez by virtue of their
acknowledged responsibility for the actions of El Bohemio Bar.

10

11 12. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and alleges thereon that on April 20, 2013, Defendant
12 Zeferino Alvarez as managing member of Sabor Bohemio, LLC and as an individual specifically
13 identified on the liquor license for El Bohemio Bar, had an obvious and direct financial interest in
14 the activities of El Bohemio Bar, which included the unlawful interception of Plaintiff's *Program*.

- 15
 13. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and alleges thereon that the unlawful broadcast of
 Plaintiff's *Program*, as supervised and/or authorized by Defendant Zeferino Alvarez resulted in
 increased profits for El Bohemio Bar.
- 18

23

24

25

28

14. Plaintiff is informed and believed, and alleges thereon that Defendant, Sabor Bohemio,
 LLC is an owner, and/or operator, and/or licensee, and/or permitee, and/or person in charge, and/or
 an individual with dominion, control, oversight and management of the commercial establishment
 doing business as El Bohemio Bar operating at 4002 East Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana
 46201.

COUNT I

(Violation of Title 47 U.S.C. Section 605)

26 15. Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, hereby incorporates by reference all of the
allegations contained in paragraphs 1-14, inclusive, as though set forth herein at length.

16. Pursuant to contract, Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, was granted the

exclusive nationwide commercial distribution (closed-circuit) rights to *Saul Alvarez v. Austin Trout Fight Program*, telecast nationwide on Saturday, April 20, 2013 (this included all under-card bouts and fight commentary encompassed in the television broadcast of the event, hereinafter referred to as the "*Program*").

4

1

2

3

For a pursuant to contract, Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, entered into subsequent
sublicensing agreements with various commercial entities throughout North America, including
entities within the State of Indiana, by which it granted these entities limited sublicensing rights,
specifically the rights to publicly exhibit the *Program* within their respective commercial
establishments in the hospitality industry (i.e., hotels, racetracks, casinos, bars, taverns, restaurants,
social clubs, etc.).

10

11 18. As a commercial distributor and licensor of sporting events, including the *Program*,
 12 Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, expended substantial monies marketing, advertising,
 13 promoting, administering, and transmitting the *Program* to its customers, the aforementioned commercial entities.

14

15
19. With full knowledge that the *Program* was not to be intercepted, received, published,
divulged, displayed, and/or exhibited by commercial entities unauthorized to do so, each and every
one of the above named Defendants, either through direct action or through actions of employees
or agents directly imputable to Defendants (as outlined in paragraphs 7-14 above), did unlawfully
intercept, receive, publish, divulge, display, and/or exhibit the *Program* at the time of its
transmission at their commercial establishment in Indianapolis, located at 4002 East Washington
Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46201.

21

22 20. Said unauthorized interception, reception, publication, exhibition, divulgence, display,
 23 and/or exhibition by each of the Defendants was done willfully and for purposes of direct and/or
 24 indirect commercial advantage and/or private financial gain.

25

26
27
21. Title 47 U.S.C. Section 605, *et seq.*, prohibits the unauthorized publication or use of communications (such as the transmission of the *Program* for which Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, had the distribution rights thereto).

28

22. By reason of the aforesaid mentioned conduct, the aforementioned Defendants, and each of 1 them, violated Title 47 U.S.C. Section 605, et seq. 2 3 23. By reason of the Defendants' violation of Title 47 U.S.C. Section 605, et seq., Plaintiff 4 G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, has the private right of action pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. Section 605. 5 6 24. As the result of the aforementioned Defendants' violation of Title 47 U.S.C. Section 605, 7 and pursuant to said Section 605, Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, is entitled to the 8 following from each Defendant: 9 10 (a) Statutory damages for each willful violation in an amount to 11 \$100,000.00 pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. 605(e)(3)(C)(ii), and also 12 (b) the recovery of full costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, 13 pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. Section 605(e)(3)(B)(iii). 14 15 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as set forth below. 16 17 COUNT II 18 19 (Violation of Title 47 U.S.C. Section 553) 20 21 25. Plaintiff's hereby incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-22 24, inclusive, as though set forth herein at length. 23 24 The unauthorized interceptions, reception, publication, divulgence, display, and/or 26. 25 exhibition of the Program by the above named Defendants was prohibited by Title 47 U.S.C. 26 Section 553, et seq. 27 28

27. By reason of the aforesaid mentioned conduct, the aforementioned Defendants, and each of 1 them, violated Title 47 U.S.C. Section 553, et seq. 2 3 28. By reason of the Defendants' violation of Title 47 U.S.C. Section 553, et seq., Plaintiff G 4 & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, has the private right of action pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. Section 553. 5 6 29. As the result of the aforementioned Defendants' violation of Title 47 U.S.C. Section 553, 7 Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, is entitled to the following from each Defendant: 8 9 (a) Statutory damages for each violation in an amount to \$10,000.00 pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. § 553(c)(3)(A)(ii); and also 10 11 (b) Statutory damages for each willful violation in an amount to 12 \$50,000.00 pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. § 553(c)(3)(B); and also 13 14 the recovery of full costs pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. Section 553 (c) 15 (c)(2)(C); and also 16 (d) and in the discretion of this Honorable Court, reasonable attorneys' fees, 17 pursuant to Title 47 U.S.C. Section 553 (c)(2)(C). 18 19 20 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as set forth below. 21 **COUNT III** 22 23 (Conversion) 24 25 30. Plaintiff's hereby incorporates by reference all of the allegations contained in paragraphs 1-26 29, inclusive, as though set forth herein at length. 27 28

31. By their aforesaid acts of interception, reception, publication, divulgence, display, and/or exhibition of the *Program* at their commercial establishment at the above-captioned address, the aforementioned Defendants, and each of them, tortuously obtained possession of the *Program* and wrongfully converted same for their own use and benefit.

32. The aforesaid acts of the Defendants were willful, malicious, egregious, and intentionally designed to harm Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, by depriving Plaintiff of the commercial license fee to which Plaintiff was rightfully entitled to receive from them, and in doing so, the Defendants subjected the Plaintiff to severe economic distress and great financial loss.

⁹ 33. Accordingly, Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC, is entitled to both compensatory, as well as punitive and exemplary damages, from aforementioned Defendants as the result of the Defendants' egregious conduct, theft, and conversion of the *Program* and deliberate injury to the Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment as set forth below.

As to the First Count:

1. For statutory damages in the amount of \$110,000.00 against the Defendants, and each of them, and

2. For reasonable attorneys' fees as mandated by statute, and

- 3. For all costs of suit, including but not limited to filing fees, service of process fees, investigative costs, and
- 4. For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court may deem just and proper;

As to the Second Count:

27
28
1. For statutory damages in the amount of \$60,000.00 against the Defendants, and each of them, and;

1		2.	For reasonable attorneys' fees as may be awarded in the Court's
2			discretion pursuant to statute, and;
		3.	For all costs of suit, including but not limited to filing fees, service
3			of process fees, investigative costs, and;
4		4.	For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court may deem just
5			and proper.
6		As to	the Third Count:
7		1.	For compensatory damages in an amount according to proof against the
8			Defendants, and each of them, and;
9		2.	For exemplary damages against the Defendants, and each of them, and;
10		3.	For punitive damages against the Defendants, and each of them, and;
11		4.	For reasonable attorneys' fees as may be awarded in the Court's discretion pursuant
12		_	to statute, and;
		5.	For all costs of suit, including but not limited to filing fees, service of process fee,
13		6	investigative costs, and;
14		6.	For such other and further relief as this Honorable Court may deem just and proper.
15			Respectfully submitted,
16			
17	Date:	April	15, 2015 <u>/s/ Charlie W. Gordon</u>
18			GREENE & COOPER LLP By: Charlie W. Gordon
19			Attorneys for Plaintiff G & G Closed Circuit Events, LLC
20			0 & 0 Closed Clicult Events, EEC
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			