Case	2:17-cv-05283-DOC-SS Document 1 File	ed 07/18/17	Page 1 of 10	Page ID #:1	
1	GLUCK LAW FIRM P.C.				
2	 Jeffrey S. Gluck (SBN 304555) 123 N. Kings Road #6 Los Angeles, California 90048 Telephone: 310.776.7413 				
3	Telephone: 310.776.7413				
4	ERIKSON LAW GROUP				
5	David Alden Erikson (SBN 189838) S. Ryan Patterson (SBN 279474) 200 North Larchmont Boulevard				
6	Los Angeles, California 90004				
7	Los Angeles, California 90004 Telephone: 323.465.3100 Facsimile: 323.465.3177				
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
9					
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION				
12					
13	VICTOR CHAPA, P/K/A "REYES," an	Case No.			
14	VICTOR CHAPA, P/K/A "REYES," an individual; and MILES MACGREGOR, P/K/A "EL MAC," an individual;	COMPLA	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, RESTITUTION AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF		
15	Plaintiff,				
16	V.	DEMANI	D FOR JURY		
17	KROTO, INC., D/B/A ICANVAS	DEMANI	JTUNJUN	IINAL	
18	ART, an Illinois corporation; and DOES 1-10 inclusive.				
19	Defendants.				
20					
21	Plaintiffs Victor Chapa, p/k/a "Reyes" ("Chapa," or "Reyes"), and Miles				
22	MacGregor, p/k/a "El Mac" ("MacGregor," or "El Mac") (collectively, "Plaintiffs")				
23	hereby complain against Defendants Kroto, Inc., d/b/a iCanvas Art ("iCanvas"); and				
24	Does 1-10 inclusive (collectively referred to as "Defendants") as follows.				
25					
26					
27					
28					
		1		COMPLAINT	
		1		CONTLAINT	

1

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

Plaintiffs bring this action for copyright infringement (17 U.S.C.
 Section 101 et seq.); and malicious prosecution under California law.

2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action and 4 5 the claims asserted herein, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1331 ("federal question" jurisdiction") and 1338(a)-(b) ("patent, copyright, trademark and unfair competition") 6 jurisdiction") in that this action arises under the laws of the United States and, more 7 specifically, Acts of Congress relating to patents, copyrights, trademarks, and unfair 8 competition. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the state law claims 9 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1367(a) ("supplemental jurisdiction") in that they are 10 so related to the federal law intellectual property claims in the action that they form 11 part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States 12 Constitution. 13

3. Defendants are subject to the personal jurisdiction of the Court because
they do or transact business in, have agents in, or are otherwise found in and have
purposely availed themselves of the privilege of doing business in California and in
this District, and because the alleged misconduct was directed to California and this
district. In addition, Defendants infringed Plaintiffs' work in California, and offered
their infringing works for sale in California.

4. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section
1391(b)(1)-(3) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to
the claims occurred in this District in that, *inter alia*, the infringing advertising was
used here.

24

THE PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Victor Chapa is a world-renowned artist, producing works
under the pseudonym "Reyes." Reyes's work has been featured in numerous art
galleries in cities across the world, including New York, San Francisco, Tokyo, and

Montreal. Reyes is perhaps most well known for his outdoor murals, which were
 celebrated in a 2010 cover story in the San Francisco Chronicle.

6. Plaintiff Miles MacGregor is a world-renowned artist, producing works
under the pseudonym "El Mac." El Mac has been commissioned to paint murals
across the United States, as well as in Mexico, Denmark, Sweden, Canada, South
Korea, Belgium, Italy, Puerto Rico, Spain, France, Singapore, Germany, Ireland, the
United Kingdom, and Vietnam.

8 7. Defendant Kroto, Inc. is an Illinois corporation operating under the
9 fictitious business name "iCanvas." Through its website, iCanvas advertises and
10 sells goods to residents of Los Angeles County, including the infringing goods at
11 issue in this case.

8. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the Defendants
sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such
fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to allege the true names and
capacities when the same has been ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes,
and thereon alleges, that each fictitiously-named Defendant is responsible in some
manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that Plaintiff's damages as herein
alleged were proximately caused by their conduct.

9. Each of the Defendants acted as an agent for each of the other
 Defendants in doing the acts alleged and each Defendant ratified and otherwise
 adopted the acts and statements performed, made or carried out by the other
 Defendants so as to make them directly and vicariously liable to the Plaintiff for the
 conduct complained of herein.

24

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

10. In or about 2006, Plaintiffs collaborated on the creation of a graffiti
mural on the side of a building located at 888 Turk St. in San Francisco, California
(the "Mural"). Like many of Reyes's and El Mac's outdoor works, this Mural was

very popular, and widely photographed by Plaintiffs' fans, and the general public
 alike. Although it was painted over when the building was refurbished in 2011, the
 fact that the Mural (shown below) remained for nearly five years is a testament to
 the Mural's popularity, as well as that of both Reyes and MacGregor's work in
 general.



17 11. In or about 2016, without Plaintiffs' knowledge, authorization, or
18 consent, Defendants obtained a photograph of the Mural, and produced low quality,
19 mass-market reproductions of Plaintiff's work, which Defendants advertised and
20 sold on their website under the title "Burning Graffiti." Although Defendants knew
21 that Plaintiffs Reyes and El Mac were the creators of the Mural, they sought to
22 conceal their infringement by attributing Plaintiffs' work to the popular, reclusive
23 street-artist Banksy.

24 12. Worse still, Defendants sold these low quality, mass-produced copies
25 of Plaintiffs' Work through mass-market, "big-box" retailers, including Walmart,
26 and Amazon.com. Nothing is more antithetical to the outsider "street cred" that is
27 essential to graffiti artists—or any fine artist, for that matter—than association with

cheap, mass-market products peddled by iCanvas, and with "big-box" retailers like
 Walmart and Amazon.com. To anyone who recognizes their work, Plaintiffs are
 now wide open to career-ending charges of "selling out."

13. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that
Defendants' alleged conduct was, and continues to be, intentional, deliberate,
willful, wanton, committed with the intention of injuring Plaintiffs, and depriving
Plaintiffs of Plaintiffs' legal rights; was, and is, despicable conduct that subjects
Plaintiffs to a cruel and unjust hardship; and was, and continues to be, undertaken
with oppression, fraud and malice. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to an award
of punitive or exemplary damages.

11 14. Defendants' actions have caused, and will continue to cause, damage
12 and irreparable harm to Plaintiffs (as described above) and are likely to continue
13 unabated, thereby causing further damage and irreparable harm to Plaintiffs, unless
14 preliminarily and permanently enjoined and restrained by the Court.

15 15. Defendants infringed as described above, and used copies of Plaintiffs'
16 pseudonym and signature, in interstate commerce.

17

18

First Claim For Relief For Copyright Infringement (Against All Defendants)

19 16. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by this reference paragraphs 1 through 15
20 as if set forth in full in this cause of action.

17. Plaintiffs' graphic expression, as shown in the image above, is an
original work of authorship and constitutes copyrightable subject matter under the
laws of the United States. The image was fixed in a tangible medium of expression,
as described above. An application for a federal registration of the artwork has been
filed with the Register of Copyrights, dated July 17, 2017; and the deposit,
application, and fee required for registration have been delivered to the Copyright
Office in proper form. The case number associated with the application is 1-

1 5635590011.

18. At all times since the creation of the graphic expression, Plaintiffs have
complied with all aspects of the Copyright Acts of 1909 and 1976 and all other laws
governing copyright, and secured the exclusive rights and privileges in and to the
graphic expression. Plaintiffs are the sole owner of all rights, title, and interest in
and to the copyright in the graphic expression.

7 19. Subsequent to Plaintiffs' creation of the graphic expression and (on
8 information and belief) with full knowledge of the rights of Plaintiffs, Defendants
9 infringed Plaintiffs' copyright by copying and reproducing, as described above, the
10 artwork and selling such copied images, and derivative works.

20. All of Defendants' acts were performed without the permission, license
or consent of Plaintiffs.

13 21. By reason of Defendants' acts of copyright infringement as alleged
14 herein, Plaintiffs have suffered and will continue to suffer substantial damage to
15 their businesses in the form of diversion of trade, loss of profits, and a diminishment
16 in the value of Plaintiffs' works, rights, and reputation, in part as described above,
17 all in amounts that are not yet ascertainable but not less than the jurisdictional
18 minimum of this court.

By reason of their infringement of Plaintiffs' copyright as alleged
 herein, Defendants are liable to Plaintiffs for the actual damages incurred by
 Plaintiffs as a result of the infringement, and for any profits of Defendants directly
 or indirectly attributable to such infringement.

Defendants' copying was willful, as alleged above.

24 25

23

23.

26 27

24. Plaintiffs incorporate herein by this reference paragraphs 1 through 23

28

Second Claim For Relief For Falsification, Removal and Alteration of

Copyright Management Information in Violation of 17 U.S.C. § 1202

(Against All Defendants)

1 as if set forth in full in this cause of action.

2 25. On information and belief, Defendants knew that Plaintiffs Reyes and
3 El Mac created the Mural because, *inter alia*, the source of the photograph that
4 Defendants used to produce the infringing goods specifically attributed the Mural to
5 Plaintiffs.

Defendants intentionally falsified copyright management information 26. 6 related to the Work with the intent to induce, enable, facilitate, or conceal an 7 infringement of Plaintiffs' rights under the Copyright Act. Specifically, on 8 Defendants' iCanvas.com website, and on third-party retailer websites selling 9 iCanvas's infringing goods. Defendants have supplied inaccurate copyright 10 management information that falsely identifies another artist, Defendants, or another 11 person or entity, that has no copyright ownership interest as the owner of copyright 12 in the Mural. 13

1427.Defendants' conduct constitutes a violation of 17 U.S.C. § 1202(a), and151202(b).

28. Defendants' falsification, removal and/or alteration of that copyright
management information was done without Plaintiffs' knowledge or authorization.

29. Defendants' falsification of said copyright management information
was done by Defendants intentionally, knowingly, and with the intent to induce,
enable, facilitate, or conceal Defendants' infringement of Plaintiffs' copyright in the
Work. Defendants also knew, or had reason to know, that such removal and/or
alteration of copyright management information would induce, enable, facilitate, or
conceal Defendants' infringement of Plaintiffs' copyright in the Work.

30. Plaintiffs have sustained significant injury and monetary damages as a
result of Defendants' wrongful acts as hereinabove alleged, and as a result of being
involuntarily associated with Defendants. Plaintiffs are at present unable to ascertain
the full extent of the monetary damages Plaintiffs have suffered by reason of said

acts. In order to determine the full extent of such damages, including such profits of
 Defendants as may be recoverable under 17 U.S.C. § 1203, Plaintiffs will require an
 accounting from each Defendant of all monies generated from their wrongful
 falsification, removal and alteration of copyright management information.

5 31. In the alternative, Plaintiffs may elect to recover statutory damages
6 pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 1203(c)(3) in a sum of not more than \$25,000 from each
7 Defendant for each violation of 17 U.S.C. § 1202.

8

9

15

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray judgment against Defendants as follows:

That Plaintiffs are awarded all damages, including future damages, that
 Plaintiffs have sustained, or will sustain, as a result of the acts complained of herein,
 subject to proof at trial;

13 2. That Plaintiffs are awarded their costs, attorneys' fees and expenses in
14 this action;

3. That Plaintiffs are awarded pre-judgment interest;

4. For an order permanently enjoining Defendants and their employees,
agents, servants, attorneys, representatives, successors, and assigns, and any and all
persons in active concert or participation with any of them, from engaging in the
misconduct referenced herein;

5. That Defendants be ordered to immediately recall and remove any and
all infringing goods from the marketplace; and any and all remaining locations,
physical or digital;

6. That Defendants be ordered to file with this Court and serve upon
Plaintiffs' counsel within thirty (30) days after services of the judgment demanded
herein, a written report submitted under oath setting forth in detail the manner in
which they have complied with the judgment;

8. For disgorgement of all proceeds, and restitution of the moneys

28

Case	2:17-cv-05283-DOC-SS Document 1	Filed 07/18/17 Page 9 of 10 Page I	D #:9		
1	wrongfully received by Defendants a	s the result of their wrongful conduct	t, including		
2	copyright and trademark infringemen	t, and unfair competition;			
3	9. For punitive damages in an amount sufficient to deter Defendants, and				
4	each of them, from their wrongful conduct; and				
5	10. For further relief, as the Court may deem appropriate.				
6	DATED: July 18, 2017	GLUCK LAW FIRM P.C.			
7					
8					
9	By:	/s/			
10		Jeffrey S. Gluck Attorney for Plaintiffs			
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
		9	COMPLAINT		

Case	2:17-cv-05283-DOC-SS Document 1	Filed 07/18/17 Page 10 of 10 Page	e ID #:10				
1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL						
2	Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on their claims on all issues triable by a						
3	jury.						
4							
5	DATED: July 18, 2017	GLUCK LAW FIRM P.C.					
6							
7							
8	By:	/s/ Jeffrey S. Gluck					
9		Attorneys for Plaintiffs					
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
		10	COMPLAINT				