

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

HONG KONG LEYUZHEN TECHNOLOGY
CO. LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE INDIVIDUALS, CORPORATIONS,
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES,
PARTNERSHIPS AND UNINCORPORATED
ASSOCIATIONS IDENTIFIED IN
SCHEDULE "A" HERETO,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:24-cv-12324-JJT-LKM

**Honorable John J. Tharp, Jr.
Magistrate Laura K. McNally**

**DECLARATION OF LIANGJIE LI IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

I, Liangjie Li, of Hong Kong, a special administrative region of the People's Republic of China, declare as follows:

1. Except as otherwise expressly stated to the contrary, this declaration is based upon my personal knowledge of the following facts and, if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the statements made herein.
2. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (the "Motion").
3. I am the Chief Operations Officer for Plaintiff Hong Kong Leyuzhen Technology Co. Ltd. ("Plaintiff"). I make this declaration from my matters within my own personal knowledge unless stated otherwise.

4. Plaintiff markets and sells women's clothing and related items under the "Rotita" brand name ("Rotita").

5. Rotita is an extremely well-known source of women's clothing in the United States and has been the subject of rampant counterfeit sales through online platforms such as Amazon, Temu, Alibaba, eBay, Walmart, and Aliexpress (the "Platform"), which is the online sales platform at issue in this action. These are the six largest online retailers in the World – and Plaintiff does not sell its products through any one of them. Rather, Plaintiff only sells its genuine Rotita brand products through its website rotita.com.

6. Plaintiff's rough estimated gross revenue from United States sales likely exceeds \$20,000,000 USD per year. Of this amount, Plaintiff roughly estimates that over \$1,000,000 is derived from sales in the State of Illinois. Moreover, Plaintiff spends roughly anywhere from \$8,000,000 to \$12,000,000 USD each year to specifically advertise its Rotita brand in the United States through such online advertising sources as Google Ads, Facebook, and Bing. Furthermore, the company has spent more than \$80,000 in filing fees paid to the United States Copyright Office just to secure registration of copyright protected works being asserted in, currently, thirteen (13) enforcement actions initiated in this judicial district. Simply put, Plaintiff is an extremely successful company that earns millions of dollars from product sales in the United States – including within the State of Illinois. To do so, Plaintiff annually spends tens of millions of dollars advertising in the United States to promote the sale of its brand.

7. The defendants named in the company's copyright infringement enforcement actions are engaged in the practice of copying Plaintiff's copyright protected product images almost instantaneously after they are first displayed on the company's website and then associating these images with sale and promotion of unauthorized, counterfeit products of substandard quality,

thereby deceiving consumers – including the citizens of the State of Illinois. Moreover, given the nature of Plaintiff's goods, such large-scale sales operations over multiple online retail platforms require considerable supply chain coordination that could not reasonably be accomplished independently by any of the named Defendants. Simply put, Plaintiff maintains that Defendants are acting in concert, pursuant to a common scheme, whereby they independently copy the company's copyright protected images, without authorization, from its website or such unauthorized images are being provided by the same common source associated with manufacturing the counterfeit products being sold on the Defendants' Platform storefronts.

8. The sophistication of Defendants' online, counterfeit sales network is further demonstrated by the skill with which they identify Schedule "A" plaintiffs, their allegedly infringed products or brands, and then immediately disseminating this information throughout their network by posting on online websites such as "SellerDefense.cn." The dissemination of this information then immediately results in the named Defendants siphoning off all illicit funds held in their online accounts.

9. Defendants have directly targeted their counterfeit sales activities, through online sales platforms not utilized by Plaintiff, in the United States, including to the residents of the State of Illinois, through, at least, fully interactive, e-commerce stores operating under their designated aliases on the Platform.

10. Plaintiff has suffered, and continues to suffer, irreparable harm through the Defendants' unauthorized use of its federally registered copyright protected images asserted in this action. This results in the direct harm to Plaintiff's brand reputation and loss of consumer goodwill, both of which are harms that are virtually impossible to ascertain the resulting economic loss.

11. Plaintiff expects to earn a net profit of approximately 30% on the sale of its Rotita brand products. This figure, however, includes substantial advertising expenses that Defendants would not have to pay since they are largely capitalizing on Plaintiff's advertising efforts by misappropriating its copyright protected images and imbedding the term "Rotita" in their Amazon.com search engine optimization. Doing so causes their online stores to be displayed whenever someone searches for "Rotita" on Amazon.com despite Plaintiff not selling authentic "Rotita" brand products on the platform. Based on the foregoing, I would estimate that Defendants' online stores operate at a net profit of between 40% to 50%. I believe that a disgorgement of Defendants' profits would fall within the net profit range. It is my understanding that Plaintiff is currently awaiting the Platform's compliance with the Temporary Restraining Order and associated subpoena issued in this action that requires it to produce such sales information. Absent receipt of such information, Plaintiff is forced to assume that all sales made by Defendants through the Platform and all amounts held in their online accounts are the result of infringing activity in violation of the company's intellectual property rights.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 9, 2025, in Hong Kong.

By: Liangjie Li
LIANGJIE LI

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 8th day of January 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, using the electronic case filing system. The electronic case filing system sent a "Notice of Electronic Filing" to the attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of this document by electronic means. Notice of this filing is provided to unrepresented parties for whom contact information has been provided via email and by posting the filing on a URL contained on our website <https://blointernetenforcement.com/>.

By: /s/ Shawn A. Mangano

Shawn A. Mangano (Bar No. 6299408)

BAYRAMOGLU LAW OFFICES LLC

1540 West Warm Springs Road Ste. 100

Henderson, NV 89014

Tel: (702) 462-5973 Fax: (702) 553-3404

shawnmangano@bayramoglu-legal.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff