

1 **DAVID J. STEELE**, CA Bar No. 209797
 david.steele@tuckerellis.com
 2 **HOWARD A. KROLL**, CA Bar No. 100981
 howard.kroll@tuckerellis.com
 3 **STEVEN E. LAURIDSEN**, CA Bar No. 246364
 steven.lauridsen@tuckerellis.com
 4 **TUCKER ELLIS LLP**
 5 515 South Flower Street
 Forty-Second Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223
 6 Telephone: (213) 430-3400
 Facsimile: (213) 430-3409
 7
 8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 Coachella Music Festival, LLC and
 Goldenvoice, LLC
 9

10
 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 13 WESTERN DIVISION

14 COACHELLA MUSIC)
 FESTIVAL, LLC and)
 15 GOLDENVOICE, LLC,)
 16 Plaintiffs,)
 17 v.)
 18 URBAN OUTFITTERS, INC. and FREE)
 PEOPLE OF PA LLC,)
 19 Defendants.)

Case No. 2:17-cv-2027
**COMPLAINT FOR:
 TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT;
 FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN
 AND UNFAIR COMPETITION;
 DILUTION;
 COMMON LAW TORTIOUS
 INTERFERENCE OF
 CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIPS;
 VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA
 TRADEMARK LAW; AND
 VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA
 UNFAIR COMPETITION AND LAW.
 DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
 Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 Plaintiffs Coachella Music Festival, LLC and Goldenvoice, LLC, (collectively,
2 “Plaintiffs”) by and through their attorneys, Tucker Ellis LLP, file their complaint against
3 Defendants Urban Outfitters, Inc. and Free People of PA LLC (collectively,
4 “Defendants”) for injunctive relief and damages as follows:

5 Plaintiffs allege as follows, upon actual knowledge with respect to themselves and
6 their own acts, and on information and belief as to all other matters.

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. Held annually, Plaintiffs’ Coachella Valley Music & Arts Festival
9 (“Coachella”) is one of the most critically acclaimed music festivals in the world, with
10 multiple bands, artists, food vendors, and stages. Coachella is a sold-out event which
11 attracts nearly 600,000 attendees to Southern California each April.

12 2. Plaintiffs own the famous Coachella Marks¹ which Plaintiffs use in
13 connection with Coachella and also with wide range of goods and services, including
14 apparel. Plaintiffs own numerous registrations for their Coachella Marks, including the
15 registration for apparel. Plaintiffs also sell sponsorships and license the use of the
16 Coachella Marks to others, including for apparel; however, Plaintiffs are extremely
17 selective and sponsorships and licenses are very limited.

18 3. Trading on the goodwill and fame of Plaintiffs’ Coachella Marks,
19 Defendants, who are not authorized or affiliated in any way with Plaintiffs, use one or
20 more of the Coachella Marks in connection with COACHELLA branded apparel.
21 Defendants also use the one or more of the Coachella Marks as a ‘keyword’ to trigger
22 Defendants’ online advertising, and within the meta-data on Defendants’ own websites,
23 to misdirect consumers searching for Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs’ Coachella Marks to
24 Defendants website which sells Defendants’ unauthorized apparel.

25 4. Defendants’ use of the Coachella Marks is likely to cause confusion, or to
26 cause mistake, or to deceive consumers that Defendants are sponsors or licensees

27 ¹ The Coachella Marks are defined below.
28

1 authorized by Plaintiffs to use the Coachella Marks, or that the apparel they sell
2 originates from, or is affiliated, connected, or associated with Plaintiffs. Defendants’ use
3 of Coachella Marks is also likely to cause dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment.
4 Defendants’ actions also constitute unfair competition.

5 5. Defendants have ignored Plaintiffs’ demands to cease their unlawful
6 conduct. Accordingly, Plaintiffs have been forced to file this action to protect the famous
7 Coachella Marks and to protect the public.

8 **THE PARTIES**

9 6. Plaintiff Coachella Music Festival, LLC, is a limited liability company
10 organized and existing under the laws of the State of Delaware, having a principal place
11 of business in Los Angeles, California. Coachella Music Festival, LLC, owns the
12 intellectual property rights to Coachella, including the Coachella Marks.

13 7. Plaintiff Goldenvoice, LLC is a limited liability company organized and
14 existing under the laws of the State of California, having a principal place of business in
15 Los Angeles, California. Goldenvoice, LLC produces the Coachella festival.

16 8. On information and belief, Defendant Urban Outfitters, Inc.
17 (“Urban Outfitters”) is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of
18 Pennsylvania, having a principal place of business located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
19 Urban Outfitters is registered with the California Secretary of State to conduct business in
20 California.

21 9. On information and belief, Defendant Free People of PA LLC (“Free
22 People”) is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State
23 of Pennsylvania, having a principal place of business located in Philadelphia,
24 Pennsylvania.

25 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

26 10. This is a complaint for trademark infringement, false designation of origin
27 and unfair competition, and dilution under the federal law, tortious interference of
28

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 contractual relationships, trademark dilution under the California law, and unfair or
2 deceptive business practices under California statutory and common law.

3 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

4 11. This case is a civil action arising under the Trademark Laws of the United
5 States, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051, *et seq.*, under the California Business and Professions Code
6 § 14247 and § 17200, *et seq.*, and California Common Law.

7 12. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claims in this Complaint
8 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a), and which involve a federal
9 question, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

10 13. This Court has pendent jurisdiction over the claims arising under California
11 law pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because the asserted state claims are substantially
12 related to the claims arising under the Trademark Laws of the United States.
13 Furthermore, this Court has pendent jurisdiction because both the state and federal claims
14 are derived from a common nucleus of operative facts and considerations of judicial
15 economy dictate the state and federal issues be consolidated for a single trial.

16 14. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that this Court
17 has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because (1) Defendants conduct business
18 within California and this judicial district; (2) Defendant Urban Outfitters operates
19 numerous physical stores in California; (3) the causes of action asserted in this Complaint
20 arise out of Defendants’ contacts with California and this judicial district; and (4)
21 Defendants have caused tortious injury to Plaintiffs in California and this judicial district.

22 15. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because, on information and belief,
23 a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a
24 substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated.

25 **PLAINTIFFS’ COACHELLA MUSIC FESTIVAL,**

26 **TRADEMARKS AND SERVICE MARKS**

27 16. Plaintiffs own and produce Coachella, one of the country’s premier music
28 and arts festivals. Printouts of several news stories about Coachella are attached to this

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 Complaint as Exhibit 1. The caption from one photograph accompanying a story from
2 CNN reads, “[a]n aerial view taken from a helicopter on Sunday shows how big the
3 [2011] festival is.”

4 17. Held annually at the 78-acre Empire Polo Club in the beautiful Southern
5 California desert, Coachella is one of the most critically acclaimed music festivals in the
6 world.

7 18. Coachella was first held in October 1999 and drew some 25,000 attendees
8 into the California desert in Southern California. Over the years,² both Coachella’s
9 attendance and its prominence have grown. Attendance to the sold-out Coachella festival,
10 aggregated over the multi-day event, is estimated at 600,000 attendees.

11 19. For the past several years, passes to Coachella sell out, and for the past few
12 years, they typically sell out in about an hour. Printouts of several news stories about
13 Coachella selling out are attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 2.

14 20. Coachella mixes some of the most groundbreaking artists from all genres of
15 music along with a substantial selection of art installations from all over the world.
16 Coachella attracts some of the world’s biggest mega-stars to perform. The list of artists
17 who have performed include: Beastie Boys, Bjork, Coldplay, Daft Punk, Depeche Mode,
18 Drake, Guns and Roses, Jane’s Addiction, Jay-Z, Kanye West, Madonna, Nine Inch
19 Nails, Oasis, Paul McCartney, Prince, Radiohead, Rage Against the Machine, Red Hot
20 Chili Peppers, Roger Waters, The Cure, The Pixies, and Tool, to list only a very few.

21 21. Coachella is about more than just music. The festival’s venue also includes
22 camping facilities for some 15,000 attendees (complete with a karaoke lounge and a
23 general store), and an amazing selection of food and beverages from a wide range of
24 restaurants. The festival also features an extensive art exhibit which includes many pieces
25 of art (including sculpture and so-called “interactive” art). The music, the food, the art,
26

27 ² Coachella was next held in April 2001 and has been held annually thereafter.
28

1 and of course, the fellowship of other attendees, taken together, makes Coachella more
2 than just a concert to attend—it truly is an experience.

3 22. Plaintiffs extensively use the Coachella Marks in connection with Coachella,
4 and with a wide range of related goods and services, including apparel and related goods.

5 23. Plaintiffs own and operate Coachella’s website, available at
6 www.coachella.com. This website has received over 25 million page views in 2016, and
7 has hosted nearly 8 million users in over 11 million sessions. Screen captures of
8 Plaintiffs’ website, available at www.coachella.com, are attached to this Complaint as
9 Exhibit 3.

10 24. Plaintiffs also produce a mobile app for Coachella for use on iPhone / iPad
11 and Android devices. Screen captures of Plaintiffs’ app from iTunes and Google are
12 attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 4.

13 25. Plaintiffs extensively promote Coachella through a variety of media,
14 including via the Internet on its website, available at www.coachella.com, and on
15 numerous social media sites including Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, to list a few.
16 Screen captures of Plaintiffs’ Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts are attached to
17 this Complaint as Exhibit 5. As can be seen from Exhibit 5, Plaintiffs’ Facebook page has
18 over 1.8 million likes and over 1.7 million followers; their Twitter account is being
19 followed by over eight hundred thousand Twitter users; and their Instagram account is
20 being followed by over nine hundred thousand Instagram users.

21 26. Plaintiffs invested over \$625,000 dollars last year alone in media and related
22 content to promote Coachella.

23 27. An Internet search using the Google search engine for the term “Coachella
24 music festival” provided over 1 million hits; a cursory review of the results shows nearly
25 every hit was related to Plaintiffs’ festival; and the first search result was to Plaintiffs’
26 www.coachella.com website.

27 28. Tracked online media impressions (advertisements) for Coachella from
28 March 1, 2016 through May 1, 2016 exceeded 70 million impressions.

1 29. Over 500 credentialed journalists, from print media, radio, television, and
2 the Internet reported live from the 2016 Coachella festival. The journalists represented
3 media outlets as diverse as Time, Billboard, and the BBC.

4 30. Plaintiffs own the exclusive trademark and service mark rights to the
5 distinctive COACHELLA trademark and service mark, having used the mark in
6 connection with the festival and related goods and services since the first Coachella
7 festival in 1999.

8 31. Similarly, Plaintiffs own the exclusive trademark and service mark rights to
9 the distinctive COACHELLA (stylized) trademark and service mark, having used the
10 mark in connection with the festival and related goods and services since the first festival
11 in 1999. A copy of the design mark is depicted below:

12 **COACHELLA**

13
14 32. Plaintiffs also own the exclusive trademark rights to the distinctive
15 COACHELLA VALLEY MUSIC AND ARTS FESTIVAL trademark and service mark,
16 having used the mark in connection with the festival and related goods and services since
17 the first festival in 1999.

18 33. The COACHELLA, COACHELLA (stylized), and COACHELLA
19 VALLEY MUSIC AND ARTS FESTIVAL marks are collectively referred to in this
20 Complaint as the “Coachella Marks.”

21 34. Since 1999, Plaintiffs’ use of the Coachella Marks has been extensive,
22 continuous, and substantially exclusive.

23 35. Coachella and the Coachella Marks have been the subject of extensive
24 newspaper articles, magazine articles, television and Internet news stories. *See*
25 Exhibits 1-2.

26 36. Plaintiffs have made, and continue to make, a substantial investment of time,
27 effort and expense in the production and promotion of Coachella and the Coachella
28 Marks.

1 37. The Coachella Marks are unique and distinctive and, as such, designate a
2 single source of origin.

3 38. As a result of Plaintiffs' efforts and use, the Coachella Marks have come to
4 be recognized by the public and members of the trade as being associated with Plaintiffs
5 and Coachella.

6 39. By virtue of the extensive scope of the sales made and the substantial sums
7 spent to advertise and promote products and services under the Coachella Marks, the
8 marks have acquired strong secondary meaning in the minds of the purchasing public and
9 the business community and are highly distinctive, famous, and serve uniquely to identify
10 Plaintiffs' products and services. Through widespread and favorable public acceptance
11 and recognition, these marks have become assets of incalculable value as symbols of
12 Plaintiffs' products and services.

13 40. Plaintiffs expend substantial effort and expense to protect the Coachella
14 Marks' distinctiveness in the marketplace. Plaintiffs extensively police unauthorized use
15 of the Coachella Marks and have sent countless cease and desist letters, and made
16 countless telephone calls, to combat misuse or unauthorized use of the Coachella Marks.
17 Plaintiffs have also commenced civil litigation to prevent misuse or unauthorized use of
18 the Coachella Marks.

19 41. Based on Plaintiffs' use, including the use described herein, Plaintiffs own
20 extensive common law trademark rights in the Coachella Marks.

21 42. In addition to their extensive common law rights, Plaintiffs own numerous
22 United States registrations for the Coachella Marks. Specifically, Plaintiffs own:

- 23 a. United States Service Mark Registration No. 3,196,119 for
24 COACHELLA. This Registration is incontestable under
25 15 U.S.C. § 1065;
- 26 b. United States Trademark Registration No. 4,270,482 for COACHELLA;
- 27
- 28

- 1 c. United States Service Mark Registration No. 3,196,129 for
- 2 COACHELLA (stylized). This Registration is incontestable under
- 3 15 U.S.C. § 1065;
- 4 d. United States Trademark Registration No. 4,266,400 for COACHELLA
- 5 (stylized);
- 6 e. United States Service Mark Registration No. 3,196,128 for
- 7 COACHELLA VALLEY MUSIC AND ARTS FESTIVAL. This
- 8 Registration is incontestable under 15 U.S.C. § 1065;
- 9 f. United States Trademark Registration No. 3,965,563 for COACHELLA
- 10 VALLEY MUSIC AND ARTS FESTIVAL;
- 11 g. United States Trademark Registration No. 4,008,651 for COACHELLA
- 12 VALLEY MUSIC AND ARTS FESTIVAL;
- 13 h. United States Trademark Registration No. 5,075,233 for CHELLA; and
- 14 i. United States Trademark Registration No. 3,851,272 for CHELLA
- 15 (stylized). This Registration is incontestable under 15 U.S.C. § 1065.

16 The registration certificate for each registration is attached to this Complaint as Exhibit 6.

17 43. Plaintiffs are extremely selective in granting sponsorships and licensing of
18 the Coachella Marks, and have entered into a very limited number of highly sought-after
19 licenses to use the Coachella Marks. A screen capture of Plaintiffs' website, available at
20 www.coachella.com, showing the authorized Coachella sponsors is attached to this
21 Complaint as Exhibit 7.

22 44. Plaintiffs closely monitor and controls all use of the Coachella Marks by
23 sponsors and licensees.

24 45. In addition to making its own sales of apparel in connection with the
25 Coachella Marks, Plaintiff licenses the Coachella Marks to H & M Hennes & Mauritz
26 AB ("H&M") for use in connection with the marketing and sale of apparel and jewelry.
27 H&M markets and sells Coachella branded apparel and jewelry throughout the United
28

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 States and has done so under license. All such uses of the Coachella Marks by H&M
2 inure and have inured to the benefit of Plaintiff.

3 46. Plaintiff also licenses the Coachella Marks to Pandora A/S (“Pandora”) for
4 use in connection with the marketing and sale of apparel and jewelry. Pandora markets
5 and sells Coachella branded jewelry throughout the United States and has done so under
6 license. All such uses of the Coachella Marks by Pandora inure and have inured to the
7 benefit of Plaintiff.

8 47. Having been widely promoted to the general public, and having exclusively
9 identified Plaintiffs and their goods and services, the Coachella Marks symbolize the
10 tremendous goodwill associated with Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs’ festival.

11 48. The Coachella Marks are a property right of incalculable value.

12 49. The Coachella Marks have for many years enjoyed unquestionable fame as a
13 result of the favorable general public acceptance and recognition.

14 50. The Coachella Marks are famous marks protected under
15 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c).

16 **DEFENDANTS’ BUSINESSES**

17 51. On information and belief, Defendant Urban Outfitters is a multinational
18 clothing corporation headquartered in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. On information and
19 belief, it sells women's and men’s fashion apparel, footwear, beauty and accessories,
20 active wear and gear, and housewares, which largely draw from bohemian, hipster,
21 ironically humorous, kitschy, retro, and vintage styles.

22 52. On information and belief, Defendant Free People is a subsidiary of Urban
23 Outfitters. Free People describes itself on its website as “a specialty women’s clothing
24 brand, [and] the destination for bohemian fashion that features the latest trends and
25 vintage collections for women who live free through fashion, art, music, and travel.”

26 53. Free People also describes its brand on its website as offering “a wide range
27 of products from apparel, to accessories, intimates, outerwear, home, and beauty – all
28

1 reflecting a high level of quality, invoking attributes of femininity, spirit, and creativity in
2 its design, while creating the perfect festival clothing.”

3 54. Defendants are using the Coachella Marks to offer goods that are directly
4 competitive with those offered by Coachella, its licensees, and/or its sponsors under the
5 Coachella Marks. For example, on Defendants’ website available at freepeople.com,
6 Defendants are offering for sale at least four products incorporating the Coachella Marks
7 into the product name. Screenshots of the webpages where these products appear are
8 attached as Exhibit 8.

9 55. In addition to offering directly competitive goods using the Coachella
10 Marks, Defendants are using the famous Coachella Marks in the webpage titles, meta
11 description tags, meta keyword tags and URLs for pages containing the directly
12 competitive goods. Screenshots highlighting these page titles, as well as a screenshots of
13 showing the URLs are attached as Exhibit 9.

14 56. Screenshots showing the source code for each of these webpages, with the
15 relevant portions of meta description and keyword tags highlighted, are attached as
16 Exhibit 10.

17 57. Defendants have also purchased one or more of the Coachella Marks as a
18 “keyword” from one or more Internet search companies, include Google. Defendants
19 further use the Coachella Marks within their online advertisement titles (or headline), and
20 with the advertisement’s “display URL.” As a result, a Google search for “Coachella
21 clothing” results in an advertisement for Defendants’ infringing goods. A screenshot of
22 such an advertisement is attached as Exhibit 11.

23 58. A screenshot of the advertisement that results from clicking on the
24 advertisement shown in Exhibit 11 is attached as Exhibit 12. The advertisement uses a
25 font evocative of Plaintiffs, of Coachella and the Coachella Marks, and that is similar to
26 the font used in the COACHELLA (stylized) mark, and which is frequently used in
27 Plaintiffs’ own advertising materials.

28

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 59. Defendants’ use as described in this Complaint evidences their intent to
2 trade off the goodwill of Plaintiffs’ marks. For example, the webpage for the product
3 “Coachella Valley Tunic” includes “summer music festival” in its description. This is a
4 reference to Plaintiffs’ use of the Coachella Marks to promote the Coachella Music
5 Festival. *See* Exhibit 9.

6 60. Defendants also sell branded apparel using the mark BELLA
7 COACHELLA. Defendants’ BELLA COACHELLA apparel is sold as through various
8 online and physical retailers, including Amazon.com, Asos, Bloomingdales, Buckle,
9 Largo Drive, Macy’s, ShopBop, YogaOutlet.com, and Zappos.com, to list a few.
10 Screenshots of the webpages where these products appear are attached as Exhibit 13.

11 61. Defendants are direct competitors with Coachella and/or its licensees and
12 sponsors as they all sell apparel.

13 62. Defendants’ goods are directly competitive with Plaintiffs’ goods and/or its
14 licensees and sponsors, as they all sell apparel.

15 63. Defendants’ apparel is directly targeting the same consumers who purchase
16 Plaintiffs’ goods and/or its licensees and sponsors’ goods.

17 64. Defendants have adopted as marks, COACHEALLA and BELLA
18 COACHELLA, which are identical or similar to Plaintiffs’ Coachella Mark.

19 65. The marketing channels used by Defendants are the same as those used by
20 Plaintiffs and/or its licensees and sponsors.

21 66. Likely purchasers of Plaintiffs’, its licensees’ and sponsors’, and
22 Defendants’ apparel, are unlikely to exercise a high degree of care when purchasing the
23 goods.

24 67. Defendants do not own any rights in the Coachella Marks.

25 68. Defendants are not affiliated with Coachella in any way.

26 69. Defendants do not sell and are not licensed to sell Plaintiffs’ goods.

27 70. Defendants had no lawful reason to use Plaintiffs’ Coachella Marks in
28 connection with the sale of their own directly competitive goods.

1 71. Plaintiffs sent Defendants a cease and desist letter on April 14, 2016
2 demanding that Defendants cease their illegal activity.

3 72. This was not the first time Plaintiffs had to make such demands of
4 Defendants.

5 73. At least as a result of receiving this letter, Defendants had actual notice of
6 both Plaintiffs' federally registered Coachella Marks and its common law rights in its
7 trademarks because Defendants have been previously put on notice concerning their
8 illegal activity.

9 74. Defendants had constructive notice of Plaintiffs' federally registered
10 Coachella Marks under 15 U.S.C. § 1072.

11 75. Defendants have knowingly and willfully used the Coachella Marks without
12 authorization from Plaintiffs.

13 **HARM TO PLAINTIFFS AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC**

14 76. Defendants' unauthorized use of the Coachella Marks creates a likelihood of
15 confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Defendants'
16 apparel, and is likely to falsely suggest a sponsorship, connection, license, or association
17 of Defendants with Plaintiffs.

18 77. Defendants' activities have irreparably harmed and, if not enjoined, will
19 continue to irreparably harm Plaintiffs and the goodwill associated with the Coachella
20 Marks.

21 78. Defendants' activities have irreparably harmed, and if not enjoined, will
22 continue to irreparably harm the general public who has an inherent interest in being free
23 from confusion, mistake, and deception.

24 79. As a direct result of Defendants' actions, Plaintiffs are suffering, and will
25 continue to suffer, irreparable injury for which there is no adequate remedy at law.
26 Money damages cannot fully repair the damage that will be done to Plaintiffs' reputation.

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Trademark Infringement Under 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1))

80. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 79 of this Complaint as though fully set forth here.

81. The Coachella Marks are inherently distinctive, strong, valid, and protectable trademarks owned by Plaintiffs.

82. Defendants are using the Coachella Marks or confusingly similar designations in connection with the sale of Defendants’ apparel products.

83. Defendants use the Coachella Marks or confusingly similar designations in connection with Defendants’ advertising.

84. Defendants’ use in commerce of the Coachella Marks is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or to deceive.

85. The above-described acts of Defendants constitute trademark infringement in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1), entitling Plaintiffs to relief.

86. Defendants have unfairly profited from the trademark infringement alleged.

87. By reason of Defendants’ acts of trademark infringement, Plaintiffs have suffered damage to the goodwill associated with the Coachella Marks.

88. Defendants’ acts of trademark infringement have irreparably harmed and, if not enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm Plaintiffs and their federally registered trademarks.

89. Defendants’ acts of trademark infringement have irreparably harmed, and if not enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm the general public who has an interest in being free from confusion, mistake, and deception.

90. By reason of Defendants’ acts, Plaintiffs’ remedy at law is not adequate to compensate for the injuries inflicted by Defendants. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to entry of a temporary restraining order against Defendants and preliminary and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116.

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 91. By reason of Defendants’ willful acts of trademark infringement, Plaintiffs
2 are entitled to treble damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

3 92. This is an exceptional case making Plaintiffs eligible for an award of
4 attorneys’ fees under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Trademark Infringement, False Designation of Origin and**

7 **Unfair Competition Under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))**

8 93. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations
9 contained in Paragraphs 1 through 90 of this Complaint as though fully set forth here.

10 94. Defendants use in commerce the Coachella Marks in connection with the
11 sale of Defendants’ apparel.

12 95. Defendants use in commerce the Coachella Marks in connection with
13 Defendants’ advertising.

14 96. Defendants’ use in commerce of the Coachella Marks is likely to cause
15 confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive the relevant public that Defendants’ goods
16 or services are authorized, sponsored, approved by, or affiliated with Plaintiffs.

17 97. The above-described acts of Defendants constitute trademark infringement
18 of the Coachella Marks and false designation of origin in violation of
19 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a), entitling Plaintiffs to relief.

20 98. Defendants have unfairly profited from the actions alleged.

21 99. By reason of the above-described acts of Defendants, Plaintiffs have
22 suffered damage to the goodwill associated with the Coachella Marks.

23 100. The above-described acts of Defendants have irreparably harmed and, if not
24 enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm Plaintiffs and the Coachella Marks.

25 101. The above-described acts of Defendants have irreparably harmed and, if not
26 enjoined, will continue to irreparably harm the general public which has an interest in
27 being free from confusion, mistake, and deception.
28

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 102. By reason of Defendants’ acts, Plaintiffs’ remedy at law is not adequate to
2 compensate for the injuries inflicted by Defendants. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to
3 entry of a temporary restraining order against Defendants and preliminary and permanent
4 injunctive relief pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116.

5 103. Because the above-described acts of Defendants were willful, Plaintiffs are
6 entitled to treble damages under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

7 104. This is an exceptional case making Plaintiffs eligible for an award of
8 attorneys’ fees under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

9 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **(Dilution Under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c))**

11 105. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations
12 contained in Paragraphs 1 through 104 of this Complaint as though fully set forth here.

13 106. Plaintiffs’ Coachella Marks are famous, as that term is used in
14 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c), and were famous before Defendants’ use of Plaintiffs’ Marks and
15 variations thereof in commerce.

16 107. Defendants’ use of the Coachella Marks and variations thereof in commerce
17 is likely to cause dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment.

18 108. The above-described acts of Defendants constitute dilution by blurring and
19 dilution by tarnishment in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c), entitling Plaintiffs to relief.

20 109. Defendants have unfairly profited from the actions alleged.

21 110. By reason of Defendants’ acts, Plaintiffs have suffered damage to the
22 goodwill associated with the Coachella Marks and have suffered and will continue to
23 suffer irreparable harm.

24 111. By reason of Defendants’ acts, Plaintiffs’ remedy at law is not adequate to
25 compensate for the injuries inflicted by Defendants.

26 112. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to entry of a temporary restraining order
27 against Defendants and preliminary and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to
28 15 U.S.C. § 1116.

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 113. By reason of Defendants’ willful acts, Plaintiffs’ are entitled to damages,
2 and that those damages be trebled, under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

3 114. This is an exceptional case making Plaintiffs eligible for an award of
4 attorneys’ fees under 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

5 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

6 **(Common Law Tortious Interference of Contractual Relationships)**

7 115. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations
8 contained in Paragraphs 1 through 114 of this Complaint as though fully set forth here.

9 116. Plaintiffs provide its sponsors and licensees with valuable, sometimes
10 exclusive, rights with respect to the use of the Coachella Marks in association with
11 various goods and services. Plaintiffs have made Defendants aware of these contractual
12 relationships though, at the very least, Plaintiffs prior cease and desist letter to
13 Defendants.

14 117. Upon information and belief, Defendants intentionally have or will induce
15 and encouraged Plaintiffs’ licensees and/or sponsors to breach their contracts when they
16 become aware of the fact that third parties, such as Defendants, are selling goods and/or
17 services bearing the Coachella Marks or confusingly similar designations without having
18 had to become an official sponsor or licensee. Defendants did so with the intent to
19 interfere with and disrupt the contractual relationships between Plaintiffs and their
20 licensees and/or sponsors. Defendants have induced, and unless enjoined, will continue to
21 induce, such authorized Coachella licensees/sponsors to breach their contracts with
22 Plaintiffs. Defendants’ conduct has denied, and will continue to deny, Plaintiffs the full
23 benefits of the contracts with authorized Coachella licensees/sponsors.

24 118. As a result of Defendants’ conduct as described herein, Plaintiffs have
25 suffered actual and compensatory damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

26 119. Defendants’ conduct as described herein constitutes tortious interference
27 with Plaintiffs’ aforementioned contractual relationships with authorized Coachella
28 licensees/sponsors.

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Dilution Under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247)

120. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 119 of this Complaint as though fully set forth here.

121. Through Plaintiffs’ extensive use of the Coachella Marks in California, it has developed common law trademark rights in those marks under California state law.

122. Plaintiffs’ Coachella Marks are famous within the meaning of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247.

123. Defendants’ use of the Coachella Marks constitutes dilution within the meaning of Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247.

124. Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to injunctive relief as well as damages in amount according to proof.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(California Common Law and Statutory Unfair Competition)

125. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1 through 124 of this Complaint as though fully set forth here.

126. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that Defendants are in direct competition with Plaintiffs.

127. Defendants’ willful, knowing, and unauthorized promotion, advertisement, sale, and offering for sale of infringing goods is causing confusion as to the source of those goods and is therefore harming Plaintiffs’ goodwill and constitutes and unlawful appropriation of Plaintiffs’ exclusive rights in its Coachella Marks.

128. Defendants have infringed Plaintiffs’ trademark rights and have offered for sale, advertised, and sold infringing goods in violation of Plaintiffs’ proprietary rights. Such acts constitute unfair trade practices and unfair competition Under California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and under the common law of the State of California.

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 129. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17203, Defendants
2 are required to disgorge and restore to Plaintiffs all profits and property acquired by
3 means of Defendants’ unfair competition with Plaintiffs.

4 130. Due to Defendants’ conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered, and will continue to
5 suffer, irreparable harm. It would be difficult to ascertain the amount of money damages
6 that would afford Plaintiffs adequate relief at law for Defendants’ acts and continuing
7 acts. Plaintiff’s remedy at law is not adequate to compensate them for the injuries already
8 inflicted and further threatened by Defendants. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to
9 preliminary and permanent injunctive relief pursuant to California Business and
10 Professions Code § 17203.

11 131. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and, on that basis allege, that Defendants’
12 conduct has been intentional and willful and in conscious disregard of Plaintiffs’ rights
13 and, therefore, Plaintiffs are entitled to exemplary or punitive damages under the
14 common law of the State of California in an amount appropriate to punish Defendants
15 and to make an example of Defendants to the community.

16 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

17 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 18 1. That the Court enter a judgment against Defendants that Defendants have:
 - 19 a. Infringed the rights of Plaintiffs in the Coachella Marks that have been
 - 20 federally registered in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1);
 - 21 b. Infringed the rights of Plaintiffs in the Coachella Marks in violation of
 - 22 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a);
 - 23 c. Diluted the rights of Plaintiffs in the Coachella Marks in violation of
 - 24 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c);
 - 25 d. Interfered with Plaintiffs’ contractual relationships in violation of
 - 26 California common law;
 - 27 e. Violated California state trademark law; and

28

1 f. Engaged in unfair competition in violation of California Business and
2 Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* and California common law.

3 2. That each of the above acts was willful.

4 3. That the Court issue a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction,
5 and permanent injunction enjoining and restraining Defendants and their agents, servants,
6 employees, successors and assigns, and all other persons acting in concert with or in
7 conspiracy with or affiliated with Defendants, from:

8 a. Engaging in any infringing activity including advertising, promoting,
9 marketing, selling and offering for sale any goods or services in
10 connection with the Coachella Marks or any similar mark;

11 b. Engaging in any activity which dilutes the Coachella Marks;

12 c. Receiving any compensation, whether in money, in kind, or otherwise,
13 for any of the acts proscribed in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above;

14 d. Engaging in any unfair competition with Plaintiffs; and

15 e. Engaging in any deceptive acts.

16 4. Requiring Defendants, their agents, servants, employees, successors and
17 assigns, and all other persons acting in concert with or in conspiracy with or affiliated
18 with Defendants, to: (a) remove any items being offered for sale which bear the
19 Coachella Marks, or any similar designation thereto; recall any items being offered for
20 sale which bear the Coachella Marks, or any similar designation thereto; deliver to
21 Plaintiffs for destruction any items so removed or so recalled.

22 5. Requiring Defendants, their agents, servants, employees, successors and
23 assigns, and all other persons acting in concert with or in conspiracy with or affiliated
24 with Defendants, to: (a) engage in corrective advertising; (b) inform consumers that
25 Defendants are not authorized sponsors of Coachella; (c) to inform consumers that
26 Defendants are not authorized licensees of Coachella or the Coachella Marks.

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1 6. That Plaintiffs be awarded damages for Defendants’ trademark infringement
2 and unfair competition and that these damages be trebled due to Defendants’ willfulness,
3 in accordance with the provisions of 15 U.S.C. § 1117.

4 7. That Plaintiffs be awarded all profits resulting from Defendants’
5 infringement of Plaintiffs’ rights and by means of Defendants’ unfair competition with
6 Plaintiffs.

7 8. That Defendants be ordered to account for and disgorge to Plaintiffs all
8 amounts by which Defendants have been unjustly enriched by reason of Defendants’
9 unlawful actions.

10 9. That Plaintiffs be awarded punitive damages by reason of Defendants’
11 unlawful actions.

12 10. For pre- and post-judgment interest on all damages.

13 11. That the Court award Plaintiffs their reasonable attorneys’ fees pursuant to
14 15 U.S.C. § 1117, 17 U.S.C. § 505, California law, and any other applicable provision
15 of law.

16 12. That the Court award Plaintiffs their costs of suit incurred herein.

17 13. For such other or further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
18

19 Dated: March 14, 2017

Tucker Ellis LLP

20 By: /s/David J. Steele
21 David J. Steele
22 Howard A. Kroll
23 Steven E. Lauridsen

24 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
25 Coachella Music Festival, LLC and
26 Goldenvoice, LLC
27
28

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiffs Coachella Music Festival, LLC and Goldenvoice, LLC hereby demand a trial by jury to decide all issues so triable in this case.

Dated: March 14, 2017

Tucker Ellis LLP

By: /s/David J. Steele

David J. Steele
Howard A. Kroll
Steven E. Lauridsen

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
Coachella Music Festival, LLC and
Goldenvoice, LLC

TUCKER ELLIS LLP
Cleveland ♦ Columbus ♦ Denver ♦ Los Angeles ♦ San Francisco

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28