

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION



Provided by:
[Overhauser Law Offices LLC](http://www.iniplaw.org)
www.iniplaw.org
www.overhauser.com

JOE HAND PROMOTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

- against -

MBK HOLDINGS, INC. d/b/a MATEY'S
RESTAURANT & BAR, BRYAN
KONIECZNY, MARK KEHOSKIE,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 3:18-cv-232

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff JOE HAND PROMOTIONS, INC., by and through its attorneys, for its
Complaint against Defendants, hereby alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiff JOE HAND PROMOTIONS, INC. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Pennsylvania with its principal place of business at 407 East Pennsylvania Blvd., Feasterville, PA 19053. Plaintiff held the exclusive commercial distribution rights to the broadcasts of the following *Ultimate Fighting Championship*® (“UFC”) pay-per-view programs, including all undercard bouts (collectively referred to as “Programs”):

UFC 202: Diaz v. McGregor 2 telecast nationwide on August 20, 2016;
UFC 203: Miocic v. Overeem telecast nationwide on September 10, 2016;
UFC 205: Alvarez v. McGregor telecast nationwide on November 12, 2016;
UFC 207: Nunes v. Rousey telecast nationwide on December 30, 2016;
UFC 208: Holm v. de Randamie telecast nationwide on February 11, 2017;
UFC 210: Cormier v. Johnson 2 telecast nationwide on April 8, 2017.

2. Upon information and belief, Defendant MBK HOLDINGS, INC.:

a. is a business entity, the exact nature of which is unknown;

- b. is a business that conducts business in the State of Indiana;
- c. conducted business as “Matey’s Restaurant & Bar” on the dates of the Programs;
- d. operates, maintains and controls the establishment known as Matey’s Restaurant & Bar, located at 110 Franklin Street, Michigan City, IN 46360 (the “Establishment”); and
- e. operated, maintained and controlled the Establishment on the dates of the Programs.

3. Upon information and belief, Defendant BRYAN KONIECZNY is an individual residing in the State of Indiana. On the dates of the Programs, Defendant BRYAN

KONIECZNY:

- a. was an officer, director, shareholder, member and/or principal of the entity owning and operating the Establishment;
- b. had a right and ability to supervise the activities of the Establishment; and
- c. had an obvious and direct financial interest in the activities of the Establishment.

4. Upon information and belief, Defendant MARK KEHOSKIE is an individual residing in the State of Indiana. On the dates of the Programs, Defendant MARK KEHOSKIE:

- a. was an officer, director, shareholder, member and/or principal of the entity owning and operating the Establishment;
- b. had a right and ability to supervise the activities of the Establishment; and
- c. had an obvious and direct financial interest in the activities of the Establishment.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question) as this civil action is brought under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47

U.S.C. § 553 (generally referred to as “Cable Piracy”) and 47 U.S.C. § 605 (generally referred to as “Satellite Piracy”).

6. Venue is proper in this District because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims occurred in this District and/or Defendants reside in this District.

FACTS

7. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, each and every allegation and averment set forth in the above paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if the same were more fully set forth at length herein.

8. Plaintiff is a company that specializes in distributing and licensing premier sporting events to commercial locations such as bars, restaurants, lounges, clubhouses and similar establishments. Since 2001, Plaintiff has been the exclusive domestic distributor for the world’s premier mixed martial arts promotion company, the Ultimate Fighting Championship®. Over the years, Plaintiff has invested a considerable amount of time and money in building a loyal customer base and retaining customers.

9. By contract, Plaintiff was granted the exclusive right to license and distribute the Programs to commercial establishments throughout the United States. The Programs broadcasts originated via satellite uplink, and was subsequently re-transmitted interstate to cable systems and satellite television companies via satellite signal.

10. Plaintiff entered into subsequent agreements with various commercial establishments in the State of Indiana that, in exchange for a fee, allowed them to exhibit the Programs to their patrons. In consideration of the aforementioned agreements, Plaintiff expended substantial monies to market, advertise, promote, administer and transmit the Programs broadcasts to those establishments in the State of Indiana.

11. Prior to the broadcasts of the Programs, Defendants could have contracted with Plaintiff and purchased authorization to exhibit the Programs in their Establishment for a fee. However, Defendants chose not to contract with Plaintiff or pay a fee to Plaintiff to obtain the proper license or authorization. At no time did Plaintiff give Defendants license, permission or authority to receive and exhibit the Programs in their Establishment.

12. By unauthorized satellite transmission or, alternatively, by unauthorized receipt over a cable system, Defendants willfully intercepted or received the interstate communication of the Programs or assisted in such actions. Defendants then unlawfully transmitted, divulged and published said communication, or assisted in unlawfully transmitting, divulging and publishing said communication to patrons in the Establishment.

13. Without authorization, license, or permission to do so from Plaintiff, Defendants exhibited the Programs to the patrons within their Establishment.

14. Defendants pirated Plaintiff's licensed exhibition of the Programs and infringed upon Plaintiff's exclusive rights while avoiding proper authorization and payment to Plaintiff. Defendants' actions were committed willfully and with the purpose and intent to secure a commercial advantage and private financial gain.

15. At the time of the wrongful conduct described herein, Defendants' agents, servants and employees were in fact Defendants' agents, servants and employees, and acting within the scope of their employment and authority as Defendants' agents, servants and employees.

SATELLITE PIRACY/CABLE PIRACY

16. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, each and every allegation and averment set forth in the above paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if the same were more fully set forth at length herein.

17. Defendants' wrongful actions, in connection with the unauthorized exhibition of the Program, as described above, violates 47 U.S.C. § 605. By reason of Defendants' violation of 47 U.S.C. § 605, Plaintiff has standing and capacity to bring a private right of action.

18. Plead in the alternative, Defendants' wrongful actions, in connection with the unauthorized exhibition of the Programs, as described above, violates 47 U.S.C. § 553, and by virtue of same, Plaintiff has standing and capacity to bring a private right of action.

19. Accordingly, Plaintiff is entitled to judgment in its favor and against each Defendant for statutory damages, in the discretion of this Court, plus interest, costs and attorneys' fees, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 605 or, alternatively, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 553.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against each Defendant as follows:

- a. for statutory damages, in the discretion of this Court, of up to the maximum amount of \$110,000.00 for the willful violation of 47 U.S.C. § 605, or alternatively, for statutory damages, in the discretion of this Court of up to the maximum amount of \$60,000.00 for the willful violation of 47 U.S.C. § 553;
- b. for Plaintiff's attorney's fees, interest, and costs of suit pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(B)(iii) or, alternatively, pursuant to § 553(c)(2)(C); and
- c. for such other and further relief to which Plaintiff may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: /s/ Matthew E. Dumas
Matthew E. Dumas, #24596-49
HOSTETTER & ASSOCIATES
515 N. Green Street, Suite 200
Brownsburg, IN 46112
T: (317) 852-2422
F: (317) 852-3748
matt@hostetterlegal.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
JOE HAND PROMOTIONS, INC.