1	ALAN HIMMELFARB - SBN 90480 KAMBEREDELSON, LLC	
2 3	2757 Leonis Boulevard Vernon, California 90058 Telephone: (323) 585-8696	
4	STEVEN W. TEPPLER	
5	MICHAEL J. ASCHENBRENER	
6	KAMBEREDELSON, LLC 350 N. LaSalle St.	
7	Suite 1300 Chicago, IL 60654	
8	Telephone: (312) 589-6370 Fax: (312) 589-6378	
9	ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS	
10	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT
11	NORTHERN DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA
12		
13	EROS, LLC, a Florida Limited Liability) Case No.
14	Company, and SHANNON GREI, d/b/a Nomine, an individual, on behalf of)) COMPLAINT FOR:
15	themselves and all others similarly situated,)) (1) Copyright Act of 1976, 17
16	Plaintiffs,) U.S.C. §§ 101, 105, 115 and) 502;
17	V.) (2) Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C.
18	LINDEN RESEARCH, INC., a Delaware) §§ 1114, 1125;) (3) Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code
19	Corporation, and LINDEN RESEARCH INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware Corp.,	 § 17200; (4) Cal. Bus. and Prof. Code
20	Defendants.	 § 17500; and, (5) Tortious Interference with
21	Defendants.) Economic Relations.
22)) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
23)
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	COMPLAINT	

Plaintiffs, by their attorneys, upon personal knowledge as to themselves and their own acts and upon information and belief as to all other matters, allege as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. Plaintiffs Eros, LLC ("Eros") and Shannon Grei, d/b/a Nomine ("Grei") (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), bring this class action complaint against Defendants Linden Research, Inc. and Linden Research International, Inc. (collectively, "Linden Lab" or "Defendant"), headquartered in San Francisco, California, for its practice of violating the real-world intellectual property rights of proprietors of virtual content within the Second Life virtual world ("Second Life"), which Linden Lab owns and operates.

2. Second Life is an adults-only online 3D virtual world that allows its users to do exactly what the name implies: live a second life separate and distinct from the users' real-world lives. Within Second Life, users (known as "Residents") can obtain employment, purchase land, commit crimes, build homes and careers, make friends, fall in love, have sex, visit museums, and most important, make and spend money.

3. Some proprietors within Second Life, including Plaintiffs, sell (virtual) items protected by real-world copyrights and trademarks.

4. Plaintiffs allege that Linden Lab has directly and secondarily violated the intellectual property rights of Plaintiffs and other Second Life proprietors. Linden Lab directly and secondarily infringes the trademark of Plaintiff Eros by using Eros's mark to sell infringing virtual goods within Second Life and by providing the tools to other infringing Second Life users. Linden Lab directly and secondarily violates the copyrights of Plaintiff Grei by reproducing and displaying her copyrighted works within Second Life, and by materially contributing to and supervising the infringing conduct of others within Second Life.

5. Linden Lab, with knowing and conscious intent to do so, profits in multiple ways and at multiple stages of all of this illegal conduct. In fact, Linden Lab derives a substantial portion of its revenues from the illegal conduct alleged in this complaint.

6. Linden Lab has the technical means to simply and easily halt the alleged conduct, but refuses to do so because it makes too much money from all the infringement.
Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit in order to prevent Linden Lab from continuing to commit trademark and copyright infringement and to recover damages for Linden Lab's unlawful behavior.

PARTIES

7. Plaintiff Eros, LLC is a seller of various goods within Second Life, including the popular SexGen® line of erotic items. Eros, LLC is a Florida limited liability company headquartered in Lutz, Florida. The CEO of Eros is Kevin Alderman, known in Second Life as "Stroker Serpentine."

14 8. Plaintiff Shannon Grei is a citizen and resident of the state of Oregon. Ms.
15 Grei is a proprietor of copyrighted works for use within Second Life.

9. Defendant Linden Research, Inc. does business as Linden Lab and operates
 Second Life®. It is a Delaware corporation headquartered in San Francisco County,
 California at 945 Battery Street, San Francisco, California 94111. Linden Research, Inc.
 does business throughout the State of California and the nation.

20 10. Defendant Linden Research International, Inc. is a member of the Linden Lab
21 family of companies. It is a Delaware corporation headquartered in San Francisco County,
22 California at 945 Battery Street, San Francisco, California 94111. Linden Research
23 International, Inc. does business throughout the State of California and the nation.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

25 11. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action pursuant to
26 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

28

27

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

COMPLAINT

12. Personal jurisdiction and Venue are proper because Linden Lab is a corporation headquartered in San Francisco County and/or because the improper conduct alleged in this Complaint occurred in, was directed from, and/or emanated or exported from California.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

13. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(c), as an Intellectual Property Action, this case shall be assigned on a district-wide basis.

FACTS RELATING TO SECOND LIFE

14. Second Life is an internet-based, hosted interactive computer simulation that allows its participants to see, hear, use and modify the simulated objects in the computergenerated environment. Second Life users adopt a Second Life name and a character or "avatar" to represent themselves virtually within Second Life.

15. Among the many real-world-like features of Second Life is its economy. Within Second Life, Residents buy and sell goods, just like people and businesses in the real world.

16. Companies large and small have set up stores and presences within Second Life and do business within Second Life, including Adidas, American Apparel, Coca-Cola, Intel, Reebok, Warner Brothers, and the NBA.

17. For example, Adidas sold its a3 Microride running shoe in the Adidas Store in Second Life and in the real-world. And just like a person in the real world might purchase these shoes to wear around town, Second Life Residents could purchase them to wear them within Second Life. The materials for shoes in-world and in the real world may be different—software code for shoes in Second Life and leather and rubber for shoes in the real world—but the purpose and use is effectively the same.



18. Plaintiffs are also among the merchants in Second Life.

1
 19. Second Life has its own currency and currency exchanges to support all this
 2 commerce.

20.

3

The Second Life currency, Linden Dollars, is represented by the symbol "L\$."

4 21. Linden Dollars can be exchanged for real-world money accepted outside
5 Second Life, including U.S. Dollars. This means that real money changes hands in Second
6 Life, and real commerce occurs.

7 22. Defendant Linden Lab operates the official exchange, LindeX, which allows
8 users to exchange Linden Dollars for U.S. Dollars—for a fee of 3.5% per transaction.

9 23. The ability to exchange Linden Dollars for U.S. Dollars—combined with
10 Linden Lab's encouragement and development tools—has allowed true commercial activities
11 to flourish within Second Life, with user-to-user transactions surpassing \$120 million (U.S.)
12 in the First Quarter of 2009 alone.

13 (https://blogs.secondlife.com/community/features/blog/2009/04/16/the-second-life-economy14 -first-quarter-2009-in-detail).

15 24. Included in Second Life's "in-world" commercial activities are the sale and
16 licensing of products and services protected by intellectual property rights, including
17 trademarks, service marks, and copyrights.

18 25. Linden Lab has long promoted the ability to sell virtual goods and services in
19 Second Life, including trademarked and copyrighted materials.

20 Second Life: the Technical Details

21 26. The Second Life Grid is the technical backbone of Second Life, comprising
22 the hardware on which the simulated world resides and all of the software and programs that
23 allow the world to exist.

24 27. Linden Lab owns and operates the Second Life Grid, hosting it on a series of
25 servers for the world itself and the items that exist inside Second Life. These items, which
26 include items that merchants, like Plaintiffs, sell in-world, are referred to as "assets." Each

27 28

asset can be identified by a universally unique identifier, or UUID. This means that each
 item Plaintiffs and others create for sale in-world— including those protected by real-world
 trademarks and copyrights—can be identified by UUIDs.

4

Second Life: How Piracy Works In-World

28 5 The Second Life Grid utilizes what is effectively a Digital Rights 6 Management ("DRM") scheme, but the nature of the system allows third-party programs to 7 bypass the DRM. For example, one such program, CopyBot, now allows users to copy 8 unique assets—even those protected by real-world trademarks and copyrights. Although 9 such use is prohibited under the Second Life Terms of Service ("TOS") and may be 10 prosecuted under the Digital Millenium Copyright Act ("DMCA"), Linden Lab conducts 11 little supervision or enforcement to insure that such content copying is eliminated, 12 minimized, or detected. Moreover, whatever DRM-type protection Linden Lab offers against 13 such piracy-enabling programs is easily circumvented and hopelessly ineffective.

14 29. Although Linden Lab may ban a Resident who is observed using CopyBot, 15 BuilderBot, CryoLife, or any number of other similar circumvention clients, it will not ban a 16 user for simply uploading or even selling copied content. In this case, Linden Lab's 17 enforcement of intellectual property law is limited to that required by the "safe harbor" 18 provisions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which requires filing a real-world 19 lawsuit. Although a few high-profile businesses in Second Life have filed such lawsuits, the 20 majority of businesses in Second Life do not make enough money to afford prosecuting the 21 matter on an individual basis. Thus, Linden Lab effectively allows piracy to run rampant in 22 Second Life and does not afford its Resident businesses any effective protection against it.

30. The DMCA does not adequately protect Second Life users primarily because
infringers can so easily circumvent it. A Second Life pirate who becomes subject to a
DMCA takedown notice will usually not challenge it, but rather will simply create a new free
account and re-upload the content, employing the tried and true whack-a-mole approach.

1 31. In some circumstances, using the DMCA for protection within Second Life is 2 not only ineffective, but actually counter-productive. Often times, Second Life infringers 3 will counter-file against the DMCA, which results in the restoration of the pirated content 4 and the release of personal information to both the rights-holder and the infringer. Because many content creators in Second Life choose to remain anonymous, this aspect of the DMCA 5 6 has an intimidating and chilling effect on those content creators who do not wish to 7 jeopardize their privacy and anonymity. Additionally, some Second Life infringers threaten 8 rights-holding merchants with the release of their protected assets for free if they file DMCA 9 claims against the infringers. Second Life infringers are all too familiar with these aspects of 10 the DMCA and use the DMCA as a shield to continue infringing and profiting with minimal 11 or no consequence.

12 13

14

32. In addition, the technical process of removal and re-instatement of content on Second Life is subject to failure that can result in content becoming unusable to the IP owner and its customers.

15 33. Also, Linden Lab has shown that it is not vigilant in enforcing DMCA
16 takedown notices, as Plaintiff Grei has experienced.

34. Accordingly, Linden Lab has made trademark and copyright infringement free
and easy, turning the Second Life community into a vast virtual flea market in which users
peddle knockoffs and pirated copies of IP-protected products and services. Despite Linden
Lab's actual knowledge of such widespread activity, it has taken no substantive action to
prevent, limit, or prohibit such widespread infringement.

35. For example, Residents attempting to purchase Eros's SexGen virtual beds in
Second Life will be presented with a selection of infringing knockoffs of trademarked virtual
goods and services, as well as the genuine article sold by Plaintiff Eros. The same is also
true for Plaintiff Grei's copyrighted saleable works.

26 27

28

1 36. Linden Lab also knowingly and willingly profits from these infringing 2 activities in numerous ways. First, pirates must rent (for real-world currency) virtual world 3 "locations" from Linden Lab in order to sell the infringing and trademarked or copyrighted 4 items or works. Second, pirates must then "upload" their infringing work, products or 5 services into the Second Life virtual world, for which Defendants impose a fee. Third, all in-6 world transactions on Second Life are made through the exchange of Linden Dollars. Linden 7 Dollars may be exchanged for real-world currency at in-world currency exchanges. Not 8 surprisingly, Linden Lab also operates the most widely used currency exchange platform in 9 the Second Life community, LindeX, for use at which it imposes an exchange fee of 3.5%. 10 Fourth, Linden Lab operates the website XStreetSL.com, which is an online marketplace for 11 goods and services to be used in Second Life. Fifth, Linden Lab also operates an in-world 12 classified ads system. Pirated works are available both on XStreetSL.com and the in-world 13 classifieds system. 14 37. In other words, Linden Lab has created in Second Life a system in which it

In other words, Linden Lab has created in Second Life a system in which it
directly engages in piracy, actively allows its users to engage in piracy by providing the tools
for it, and by which it profits from its own piracy and the piracy of its users. As a result,
Linden Lab is violating established intellectual property law and the fact that the forum for
the infringement is a new one—an online virtual world—does nothing to shield it from
liability.

20 Second Life Terms of Service

38. At all times relevant to this Complaint, the Second Life Terms of Service
(http://secondlife.com/corporate/tos.php) recognize and allow Second Life users to retain all
intellectual property rights in the digital content that they create, place, or otherwise own
within Second Life.

25 39. As of August 31, 2009, the Second Life Terms of Service state in relevant
26 part:

- 27 28
- COMPLAINT

1.3 Content available in the Service may be provided by users of the Service, rather than by Linden Lab. Linden Lab and other parties have rights in their respective content, which you agree to respect.

You acknowledge that Linden Lab and other content providers have rights in their respective Content under copyright and other applicable laws and treaty provisions, and that except as described in this Agreement, such rights are not licensed or otherwise transferred by mere use of the Service. . . .

3.2 You retain copyright and other intellectual property rights with respect to Content you create in Second Life, to the extent that you have such rights under applicable law....

Users of the Service can create Content on Linden Lab's servers in various forms. Linden Lab acknowledges and agrees that, subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, you will retain any and all applicable copyright and other intellectual property rights with respect to any Content you create using the Service, to the extent you have such rights under applicable law.

40. Plaintiffs did not grant Linden Lab any license, authorization, permission or consent to use the pirated goods, services or works. Instead, in violation of Plaintiffs' rights under copyright and trademark law, Linden Lab has by the acts alleged herein willfully, intentionally, and purposefully infringed the copyrighted works and trademarked goods and services, and/or knowingly facilitated, enabled, induced, and materially contributed to infringing uses thereof, and/or refused to exercise its ability to control or supervise infringing uses thereof.

41. Linden Lab directly derives substantial financial benefits from this scheme, including by earning revenue from licensing the virtual real estate used to offer and sell, imposing of a fee for the upload of infringing works, goods or services by infringers, and charging promotional and advertising fees. Linden Lab also retains a portion of the proceeds of nearly every sale associated with the infringed trademarks and copyrights by infringers, and from the overall increase in user traffic and commercial value of its business and

property arising from the "draw" of infringing copyrighted and trademarked intellectual property of others.

42. Further, Linden Lab has continued to willfully infringe Plaintiffs' rights even after Plaintiffs notified them that its use of Plaintiffs' trademarked goods and services and copyrighted materials violates Plaintiffs' rights under copyright and trademark law.

43. Defendant Linden Lab knows, or should know, and/or with reasonable diligence could ascertain, a substantial amount of content in Second Life is protected by trademark and copyright laws.

9 44. Plaintiffs did not grant the pirates and their customers any license,
10 authorization, permission, or consent to use the pirated goods, services or works. Instead, and
11 in violation of Plaintiffs' rights under copyright law and trademark law, Linden Lab has
12 willfully, intentionally and with disregard to Plaintiffs' intellectual property rights infringed
13 and secondarily infringed the same.

4 45. Not only has Linden Lab engaged in violations of the Lanham Act and
Copyright Act by directly, vicariously, and contributorily infringing Plaintiffs' copyrights
and trademarks, and by inducing others to infringe the same, Linden Lab has also knowingly
and intentionally engaged in and continues to engage in unfair, deceptive, and misleading
business practices under California law.

46. By its actions alleged herein, Linden Lab has engaged in tortious interference
with economic relations under California law.

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

FACTS RELATING TO PLAINTIFF EROS

47. Eros, LLC is a proprietor of, among other items, adult-themed merchandise
within Second Life[®]. Eros's CEO is Kevin Alderman, aka Stroker Serpentine.

48. Mr. Alderman is among Second Life's most famous and successful merchants,
having been profiled in *Wired*, *Business Week*, *CBS News*, and *Fox Business Channel*.

27

28

26

49. Among the virtual products Eros markets and sells within Second Life is its SexGen® line of adult-themed animation sequences. SexGen products, of which there are nearly forty (40) distinct virtual products, are not only the most popular among their competitors within Second Life, but are also among the most popular virtual products of any kind within Second Life. Eros counts over 100,000 active Second Life users as customers.

50. As a result of Eros's substantial sales and its CEO's notoriety, the SexGen mark has become famous and distinctive among the relevant consumers, serving to distinguish Eros's goods among its competitors and to identify Eros as the source of the goods.

10 51. Eros owns the SexGen® mark, which is registered on the principal trademark
11 register as United States trademark registration number 3483253. Eros filed for the mark on
12 June 11, 2007 and it became a registered service mark on August 12, 2008.

13 52. The SexGen mark is categorized as one "[p]roviding temporary use of non14 downloadable software for animating three-dimensional virtual characters," according the
15 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. It was first used as of January 1, 2005.

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

FACTS RELATING TO TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

17 53. Plaintiff Eros's virtual erotic SexGen products sold for use in Second Life 18 have been counterfeited, cloned, and ripped off countless times by a multitude of Second Life 19 Residents. The manner in which this has occurred is akin to the knockoff handbags and 20 purses sold near Canal Street in New York City. Some of the bags are stolen, but actual 21 brand-name handbags sold at deep discounts, while many others are knockoffs that merely 22 use the brand-name makers' designs and trademarks. The same is true of the knockoff 23 SexGen products sold within Second Life. In either case, Linden Lab and merchants in 24 Second Life are infringing Eros's registered trademark.

25 54. These two methods do damage to Eros in different ways. Those merchants
26 who actually clone Eros's products and resell them are selling Eros's goods without

compensating Eros, falsely designating the origin of the goods, and causing confusion among
 consumers in the process. These companies are making money only because of the goodwill
 that Eros had already generated for the SexGen brand. On the other hand, those merchants
 who sell cheap, imitation knock-offs bearing the SexGen mark harm Eros by causing further
 confusion among consumers when the products they purchased do not function in the ways
 they expect SexGen products to function. This harms the SexGen mark and Eros.

55. Second Life Resident Eva Capalini made unauthorized use of Eros's SexGen
mark by creating counterfeit SexGen products and selling them to other Residents. Making
matters worse, Eva Capalini created the counterfeit SexGen products in such a way that other
Second Life IP pirates, such as LindAn Figgis and Good Hax, could copy her counterfeits
and sell them. This allowed Eva Capalini's counterfeit products to sell with great volume
and cause great harm to Plaintiff Eros.

13 56. Second Life Residents Rase Kenzo (Thomas Simon of New York) and
14 Volkov Catteno (Robert Leatherwood of Azle, Texas) also made unauthorized use of Eros's
15 SexGen mark by cloning, or creating exact replicas, of SexGen's products for sale within
16 Second Life.

17 57. Eva Capalini's infringing activities are particularly notable. On June 17, 18 2008, Linden Lab disabled access by Second Life Residents to the SexGen-infringing assets 19 created by Eva Capalini. Promptly thereafter, though, Linden Lab restored access to the 20 disabled content because of public outcry within Second Life. Because the infringing content 21 bore the SexGen mark, Residents blamed Eros for the broken content. As a result, Eros was 22 forced to launch an extensive marketing campaign to rectify public perception (created by an 23 infringer and Linden Lab) that Eros's SexGen products are unreliable. Eros even offered 24 genuine replacement products to unsuspecting purchasers of infringing content in order to 25 salvage its reputation.

26

58. These are just a few of the examples of those who infringed the SexGen mark
 within Second Life.

59. The use by Eva Capalini, Rase Kenzo, Volkov Catteno, LindAn Figgis, and Good Hax of the SexGen mark was in connection with goods and services.

60. The use by Eva Capalini, Rase Kenzo, Volkov Catteno, LindAn Figgis, and Good Hax of the SexGen mark occurred on the internet, which is inherently in interstate commerce. Second Life can be and is used around the world, including all states in the U.S.

8 61. The use by Eva Capalini, Rase Kenzo, Volkov Catteno, LindAn Figgis, and
9 Good Hax of the SexGen mark created a likelihood of consumer confusion as to whether
10 these Residents' virtual products were the real SexGen products made by Eros or knockoffs
11 and whether Eros would support these Residents' imitation products.

62. Linden Lab had actual or constructive knowledge that these Residents were using the Second Life platform to infringe Eros's SexGen mark.

14 63. Linden Lab directly controls and monitors the technology and systems that 15 comprise the Second Life platform, which is what these Residents used to infringe the 16 SexGen mark. Everything necessary to infringe Eros's mark is stored on Linden Lab's 17 servers, including: the in-world locations where these Residents infringed on the SexGen 18 mark; the LindeX currency exchanges where these Residents and other infringers exchange 19 Linden Dollars for real-world currency. Additionally, Linden Lab rents or sells the virtual 20 land and sites, and the actual facilities necessary for infringers to pirate Eros's mark. Linden 21 Lab also charges upload fees and promotional fees to infringers uploading pirated content 22 they intend to sell in-world. Finally, Linden Lab directly profits from the LindeX currency 23 exchanges that infringers like these Residents use to exchange ill-gotten in-world gains for 24 real-world currency.

27

26

25

3

4

5

6

7

12

13

28

1	64.	Linden Lab, on an ongoing basis, knowingly and voluntarily continues to	
2	engage in infringing activities in order to generate revenue and commercial gain, despite		
3	knowledge that its activities are in direct violation of applicable federal law.		
4	65.	Linden Lab has financially benefitted from the damage those like the	
5	infringers nar	ned above have inflicted on Eros's SexGen mark.	
6	66.	Linden Lab operates a marketplace both in-world and at XStreetSL.com.	
7	Second Life Residents can search for and purchase thousands of virtual items for use in		
8	Second Life in these marketplaces.		
9	67.	Plaintiff Eros's trademark-protected SexGen virtual products are available in	
10	these marketp	places, along with infringing products sold by competitors.	
11	68.	Linden Lab places "Featured Items" at the top of product search results.	
12	Searching for	"SexGen" will generate both legitimate and infringing "Featured Items"	
13	listings.		
14	69.	The infringing goods reside in servers wholly controlled by Linden Lab.	
15		FACTS RELATING TO PLAINTIFF GREI	
16	70.	Shannon Grei, d/b/a Nomine and known in-world as Munchflower Zaius, is a	
17	proprietor of so-called "skins," clothing and other coverings for Residents to wear within		
18	Second Life.		
19	71.	Ms. Grei is also among Second Life's more recognizable and successful	
20	merchants, ha	wing been featured by Reuters, Newsweek, and the CBS Evening News.	
21	72.	Since 2004, Ms. Grei has sold hundreds of thousands of her Nomine products	
22	within Second Life.		
23	73.	As a result of Ms. Grei's substantial sales, notoriety, and promotional efforts,	
24	the Nomine b	rand has become famous and distinctive among the relevant consumers, serving	
25	to distinguish	Ms. Grei's goods among its competitors and to identify Ms. Grei as the source	
26	of the goods.		
27			
28	COMPLAINT		
		14	

74. Ms. Grei owns the copyright to "Nominee Araignee Set," which she registered with the United States Copyright Office on September 24, 2007 and bears the registration number VAu000958340. The Copyright Office lists its date of creation as 2005 and categories it as "Visual Material."

5

6

7

8

9

1

2

3

4

FACTS RELATING TO COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

75. Plaintiff Grei's copyrighted skins and clothing sold for use in Second Life have been counterfeited, cloned, and ripped off countless times by a multitude of Second Life Residents who then sell the copyrighted skins as their own in blatant violation of her rights under copyright law.

10 76. Second Life Resident Rase Kenzo (Thomas Simon of New York) made
11 unauthorized use of Grei's copyrighted works—in particular, the virtual clothes she sells—by
12 copying these virtual clothes and selling them within Second Life.

13 77. Second Life Resident Peta Voom also made unauthorized use of Grei's
14 copyrighted works—in this case, nearly every item in her store—by directly copying her
15 designs and selling them within Second Life.

16 78. These are just a few of the examples of those who infringed the Nomine mark
17 within Second Life.

18 79. Linden Lab had actual or constructive knowledge that these Residents were
19 using the Second Life platform to infringe Grei's Nomine copyright.

80. Linden Lab both materially contributes to the infringement and has the right
and ability to supervise the infringing conduct because it directly controls and monitors the
technology and systems that comprise the Second Life platform, which is what these
Residents used to infringe the Grei's copyrighted works. Everything necessary to infringe
Grei's works is stored on Linden Lab's servers, including: the in-world locations where these
Residents infringed on Grei's works; the LindeX currency exchanges where these Residents
and other infringers exchange Linden Dollars for real-world currency. Additionally, Linden

Lab rents or sells the virtual land and sites, and the actual facilities necessary for infringers to
 pirate Grei's works. Linden Lab also charges upload fees to infringers uploading pirated
 content they intend to sell in-world. Finally, Linden Lab directly profits from the LindeX
 currency exchanges that infringers like these Residents use to exchange ill-gotten in-world
 gains for real-world currency.
 81. Linden Lab, on an ongoing basis, knowingly and voluntarily continues to

engage infringing activities in order to generate revenue and commercial gain, despite knowledge that its activities are in direct violation of applicable federal law.

82. Linden Lab has financially benefitted from the damage those like the
infringers named above have inflicted on Grei's copyrighted works.

11 83. Linden Lab operates a marketplace both in-world through its fee-based
12 classifieds and at XStreetSL.com. Second Life Residents can search for and purchase
13 thousands of virtual items for use in Second Life in these marketplaces.

14 84. Plaintiff Grei's copyright-protected virtual products are available in these
15 marketplaces, along with infringing products sold by competitors.

16 85. Linden Lab directly infringes Grei's copyrighted works by displaying the
17 infringing works throughout Second Life.

18 86. Linden Lab also directly infringes Grei's copyrighted works by reproducing
19 the infringing works on its own servers and computers.

20 21 87. The infringing works exist in servers wholly controlled by Linden Lab.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

88. Plaintiff Eros brings this action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) and
23(b)(3) on behalf of itself and two classes, the Trademark Owner Class and the Trademark
Infringement Class. Plaintiff Grei brings this action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) and
23(b)(3) on behalf of herself and two classes, the Copyright Owner Class and the Copyright
Infringement Class:

27 28

a) The Trademark Owner Class. All individuals and entities in the United States who own, have owned, or otherwise have the right to enforce licensing rights to goods and services bearing trademarks or service marks registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and who engage or have engaged in commercial transactions in Second Life associated with such registered trademark or service marks.

b) The Trademark Infringement Class. All individuals and entities in the United States who (1) own, have owned, or otherwise have the right to enforce licensing rights to goods and services bearing trademarks or service marks registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (2) engage or have engaged in commercial transactions in Second Life associated with such registered trademark or service marks, and (3) whose trademarks and/or service marks were infringed in Second Life.

c) The Copyright Owner Class. All individuals and entities in the United States who own, have owned, or otherwise have the right to enforce licensing rights in connection with a copyright registered with the U.S. Register of Copyrights and who engage or have engaged in commercial transactions in Second Life associated with such copyrighted works.

d) The Copyright Infringement Class. All individuals and entities in the United States who (1) own, have owned, or otherwise have the right to enforce licensing rights in connection with a copyright registered with the U.S. Register of Copyrights (2) engage or have engaged in commercial transactions in Second Life associated with such copyrighted works, and (3) whose copyrights were infringed in Second Life.

Excluded from each Class are Defendants, their legal representatives, assigns, and
 successors, and any entity in which Defendants have a controlling interest. Also excluded is
 the judge to whom this case is assigned and the judge's immediate family.

89. The Classes consist of thousands of individuals and other entities, making joinder impractical.

90. The claims of Plaintiffs Eros and Grei are typical of the claims of all of the other members of their respective Classes.

91. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the
other members of the Classes and Subclass. Plaintiffs have retained counsel with substantial
experience in prosecuting complex litigation and class actions. Plaintiffs and their counsel
are committed to vigorously prosecuting this action on behalf of the members of the Classes
and Subclass, and have the financial resources to do so. Neither Plaintiffs nor their counsel
have any interest adverse to those of the other members of the Classes.

Absent a class action, most members of the Classes and Subclass would find
the cost of litigating their claims to be prohibitive and will have no effective remedy. The
class treatment of common questions of law and fact is also superior to multiple individual
actions or piecemeal litigation in that it conserves the resources of the courts and the litigants,
and promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication.

19 93. Linden Lab has acted and failed to act on grounds generally applicable to
20 Plaintiffs and the other members of the Classes, requiring the Court's imposition of uniform
21 relief to ensure compatible standards of conduct toward the members of the Classes.

94. The factual and legal bases of Linden Lab's liability to Plaintiffs and to the
other members of the Classes are the same, resulting in injury to Plaintiffs and all of the other
members of the Classes. Plaintiffs and the other members of the Classes have all suffered
harm and damages as a result of Linden Lab's wrongful conduct.

27

28

26

4

5

6

7

1	95.	There are many questions of law and fact common to the claims of Plaintiffs
2	and the other members of the Classes, and those questions predominate over any questions	
3	that may affect individual members of the Classes. Common questions for the Classes	
4	include but are not limited to the following:	
5		(a) whether Linden Lab's conduct described herein constitutes direct
6		and/or secondary trademark infringement under the Lanham Act and
7	trademark law;	
8		(b) whether Linden Lab's conduct described herein constitutes direct
9		and/or secondary copyright infringement under the Copyright Act;
10		(c) whether Linden Lab's practices constitute unfair and deceptive acts or
11		practices; and,
12		(d) whether Linden Lab's conduct constitutes tortious interference with
13		economic relations under California law.
14	96.	The questions of law and fact common to the members of the class
15	predominate over any questions affecting only individual members and a class action is	
16	superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this	
17	controversy.	
18	97.	Plaintiffs reserve the right to revise these definitions based on facts learned in
19	discovery.	
20		FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
21		Trademark Infringement, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)
22		(on behalf of Plaintiff Eros and Trademark Infringement Class)
23	98.	Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.
24	99.	Trademark infringement under § 1114(1) of the Lanham Act occurs when a
25	defendant, wi	ithout the consent of the registrant, uses in commerce any reproduction,
26		
27		
28	COMPLAINT	
		19

counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of a registered mark that is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception.

100. In order to sustain a claim of trademark infringement under § 1114(1), Eros must show that it has a valid, protectable mark, and that Linden Lab's use of the mark is likely to cause confusion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

23

24

25

26

27

28

101. Eros's mark, SexGen, is a registered trademark.

102. Linden Lab uses in commerce Plaintiff Eros's SexGen mark to sell infringing, counterfeit products in its in-world marketplace and XStreetSL.com online marketplace by way of its "Featured Items" placed by Linden Lab at the top of search results for "SexGen."

10 103. By using Eros's SexGen mark to sell both legitimate and infringing,
11 counterfeit SexGen products, Linden Lab's use of the mark is likely to cause confusion.

104. Linden Lab's acts of infringement of the SexGen mark have been willful, intentional, and purposeful, in disregard of and indifferent to the rights of Plaintiff Eros.

14 105. Linden Lab benefits from the infringement by way of increased revenue
15 derived from additional product uploads, virtual land rentals, and additional currency
16 exchanges.

17 106. Linden Lab's trademark infringement has caused injury to Eros in the form of
18 lost sales and revenue, lost business reputation, consumer confusion. Linden Lab's
19 trademark infringement has also caused Plaintiff Eros irreparable injury. Unless restrained
20 and enjoined, Linden Lab will continue to commit such acts. Plaintiff's remedy at law is not
21 adequate to compensate it for these inflicted and threatened injuries, entitling Plaintiff to
22 remedies including injunctive relief.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

False Designation of Trademark Origin, 15 U.S.C. § 1125
(on behalf of Plaintiff Eros and Trademark Infringement Class)
107. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.

COMPLAINT

1 108. Trademark infringement under § 1125(a) (False Designation of Origin) occurs 2 when a defendant (1) uses in commerce (2) any word, false designation of origin, false or 3 misleading description, or representation of fact, which (3) is likely to cause confusion or 4 misrepresents the characteristics of his or another person's goods or services. 5 109. Linden Lab uses in commerce Plaintiff Eros's SexGen mark to sell infringing, 6 counterfeit products in its in-world marketplace and XStreetSL.com online marketplace by 7 way of its "Featured Items" placed by Linden Lab at the top of search results for "SexGen." 8 110. By using Eros's SexGen mark to sell both legitimate and infringing, 9 counterfeit SexGen products, Linden Lab is likely to cause confusion and misrepresents the 10 characteristics, nature, and qualities of another Second Life proprietor's virtual goods. 11 111. Linden Lab's acts of infringement of the SexGen mark have been willful, 12 intentional, and purposeful, in disregard of and indifferent to the rights of Plaintiff Eros. 13 Linden Lab benefits from the infringement by way of increased revenue 112. 14 derived from additional product uploads, virtual land rentals, and additional currency 15 exchanges. 16 Linden Lab's trademark infringement has caused injury to Eros in the form of 113. 17 lost sales and revenue, lost business reputation, consumer confusion. 18 114. Linden Lab's trademark infringement has also caused Plaintiff Eros 19 irreparable injury. Unless restrained and enjoined, Linden Lab will continue to commit such 20 acts. Plaintiff's remedy at law is not adequate to compensate it for these inflicted and 21 threatened injuries, entitling Plaintiff to remedies including injunctive relief. 22 THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION 23 Contributory Trademark Infringement, 15 U.S.C. § 1114 (on behalf of Plaintiff Eros and Trademark Infringement Class) 24 25 115. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 26 27 28 COMPLAINT

116. Contributory trademark infringement occurs when a defendant either intentionally induces a third party to infringe a person's mark, or supplies a service or product to a third-party with actual or constructive knowledge that the service or product is being used to infringe the person's mark.

117. Defendant Linden Lab supplied an infringing service—the Second Life platform—to infringing entities with actual or constructive knowledge that these entities were and are violating Plaintiff Eros's trademark by mislabeling its imitation products as genuine SexGen products.

9 118. Linden Lab exercised direct control and monitoring of the Second Life
10 platform and XStreetSL.com website used by Second Life Residents to infringe on Eros's
11 SexGen registered trademark.

12 119. The infringing products are sold within Linden Lab's Second Life platform
13 and at Linden Lab's XStreetSL.com website, and both of these systems are used to locate and
14 obtain the infringing material.

15 120. Linden Lab had the power to remove infringing material from Second Life
16 and XStreetSL.com, but failed or refused to do so.

17 121. Linden Lab benefits from the infringement by way of increased revenue
18 derived from additional product uploads, virtual land rentals, and additional currency
19 exchanges.

20 122. Linden Lab's acts of infringement of the SexGen mark have been willful,
21 intentional, and purposeful, in disregard of and indifferent to the rights of Plaintiff Eros.

123. Linden Lab's contributory trademark infringement has caused injury to Eros
in the form of lost sales and revenue, lost business reputation, consumer confusion.

24 124. Linden Lab's contributory trademark infringement has also caused Plaintiff
25 Eros irreparable injury. Unless restrained and enjoined, Linden Lab will continue to commit

27

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

4 Vicarious Trademark Infringement, 15 U.S.C. § 1114 5 (on behalf of Plaintiff Eros and Trademark Infringement Class) 125. 6 Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 7 126 Vicarious trademark infringement occurs when a defendant controls, directs, 8 facilitates, encourages, promotes, allows, enables, or otherwise permits a third-party to 9 infringe a mark, and receives a benefit from doing so. 10 127. Linden Lab exercises joint ownership or control over the infringing products 11 and services because it maintains the right, power, and ability to control, edit, alter, modify, 12 and maintain the software, hardware, and entire computer infrastructure and eco-system used 13 to effectuate third-party infringements. 14 128. Linden Lab exercised direct control and monitoring of the Second Life 15 platform and XStreetSL.com website used by Second Life Residents to infringe on Eros's 16 SexGen registered trademark. 17 129. The infringing products are sold within Linden Lab's Second Life platform 18 and at Linden Lab's XStreetSL.com website, and both of these systems are used to locate and 19 obtain the infringing material. 20 Linden Lab had the power to remove infringing material from Second Life 130. 21 and XStreetSL.com, but failed or refused to do so. 22 131. Linden Lab benefits from the infringement by way of increased revenue 23 derived from additional product uploads, virtual land rentals, and additional currency 24 exchanges. 25 132. Linden Lab's acts of infringement of the SexGen mark have been willful, 26 intentional, and purposeful, in disregard of and indifferent to the rights of Plaintiff Eros. 27 28 COMPLAINT 23

such acts. Plaintiff's remedy at law is not adequate to compensate it for these inflicted and

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

threatened injuries, entitling Plaintiff to remedies including injunctive relief.

1

2

133. Linden Lab's contributory trademark infringement has caused injury to Eros in the form of lost sales and revenue, lost business reputation, consumer confusion.

134. Linden Lab's contributory trademark infringement has also caused Plaintiff Eros irreparable injury. Unless restrained and enjoined, Linden Lab will continue to commit such acts. Plaintiff's remedy at law is not adequate to compensate it for these inflicted and threatened injuries, entitling Plaintiff to remedies including injunctive relief.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Direct Copyright Infringement—Public Display, 17 U.S.C. § 501 (on behalf of Plaintiff Grei and Copyright Infringement Class)

135. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.

136. Linden Lab, without the permission or consent of Plaintiff Grei, and without authority, is publicly displaying and purporting to authorize the public display of Ms. Grei's registered copyrighted visual works. Linden Lab causes these works to be publicly displayed by showing individual images of infringing virtual clothing and skins in response to searches for her Nomine skins in Second Life and on XStreetSL.com. Linden Lab's conduct constitutes direct infringement of Plaintiff Grei's exclusive rights under the Copyright Act to publicly display her copyrighted visual works.

137. Linden Lab's acts of infringement have been willful, intentional, and purposeful, in disregard of and indifferent to the rights of Plaintiff Grei.

138. As a direct and proximate result of Linden Lab's infringement of Plaintiff
Grei's copyrights and exclusive rights under copyright, Ms. Grei is entitled to the maximum
statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c). Alternatively, at Plaintiff Grei's election,
pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), she shall be entitled to her actual damages plus Linden Lab's
profits from infringement, as will be proven at trial.

5 139. Plaintiff Grei is entitled to her costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees,
6 pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.

140. Linden Lab's conduct is causing and, unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause Plaintiff Grei great and irreparable injury that cannot fully be compensated or measured in money. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502, Plaintiff Grei is entitled to a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to employ reasonable methodologies to prevent or limit infringement of Plaintiff Grei's copyrights.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Direct Copyright Infringement—Reproduction, 17 U.S.C. § 501 (on behalf of Plaintiff Grei and Copyright Infringement Class)

141. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.

142. Linden Lab, without authority, is making, causing to be made, and purporting to authorize the making of unauthorized copies of Plaintiff Grei's registered copyrighted visual works. Defendant Linden Lab's conduct constitutes direct infringement of Plaintiff Grei's exclusive right under the Copyright Act to reproduce her copyrighted works.

143. Linden Lab's acts of infringement have been willful, intentional, and purposeful, in disregard of and indifferent to the rights of Plaintiff Grei.

144. As a direct and proximate result of Linden Lab's infringement of Plaintiff Grei's copyrights and exclusive rights under copyright, Ms. Grei is entitled to the maximum statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c). Alternatively, at Plaintiff Grei's election, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), she shall be entitled to her actual damages plus Linden Lab's profits from infringement, as will be proven at trial.

1 145. Plaintiff Grei is entitled to her costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees,
 2 pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.

146. Linden Lab's conduct is causing and, unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause Plaintiff Grei great and irreparable injury that cannot fully be compensated or measured in money. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502,

Plaintiff Grei is entitled to a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to employ reasonable methodologies to prevent or limit infringement of Plaintiff Grei's copyrights.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Contributory Copyright Infringement, 17 U.S.C. § 501

(on behalf of Plaintiff Grei and Copyright Infringement Class)

147. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.

148 Contributory copyright infringement occurs when a defendant has knowledge of another's infringement and either materially contributes to or induces that infringement.

149. Second Life users have infringed and are infringing Plaintiff Grei's rights in her registered copyrighted visual works by uploading and selling infringing copies of Plaintiff Grei's copyrighted works within Second Life and publicly displaying without authorization. Second Life users are therefore directly infringing Plaintiff Grei's exclusive rights of reproduction and public display under 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(1) and (5).

150. Linden Lab has knowledge that Second Life Residents have and are infringing Plaintiff Grei's copyrighted works within Second Life.

151. Linden Lab has and continues to materially contribute to the infringement by supplying the Second Life platform and tools to infringers, without which those individuals would not be able to infringe Plaintiff Grei's registered copyright.

152. Linden Lab's acts of infringement have been willful, intentional, and purposeful, in disregard of and indifferent to the rights of Plaintiff Grei.

153 As a direct and proximate result of Linden Lab's infringement of Plaintiff's copyrights and exclusive rights under copyright, Plaintiff Grei is entitled to the maximum statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c). Alternatively, at Plaintiff's election, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), Plaintiff shall be entitled to her actual damages plus Linden Lab's profits from infringement, as will be proven at trial.

154. Plaintiff Grei is entitled to her costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.

155. Linden Lab's conduct is causing and, unless enjoined by this Court, will continue to cause Plaintiff great and irreparable injury that cannot fully be compensated or measured in money. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502, Plaintiff Grei is entitled to a permanent injunction requiring Linden Lab to employ reasonable methodologies to prevent or limit infringement of Plaintiff's copyrights.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Vicarious Copyright Infringement, 17 U.S.C. § 501

(on behalf of Plaintiff Grei and Copyright Infringement Class)

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

156. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.

157. Vicarious copyright infringement occurs when a defendant has the right and ability to supervise the infringing conduct, and has a direct financial interest in the infringing 14 activities.

15 158. Second Life users have infringed and are infringing Plaintiff Grei's rights in her registered copyrighted visual works by uploading and selling infringing copies of 16 17 Plaintiff Grei's copyrighted works within Second Life and publicly displaying without 18 authorization. Second Life users are therefore directly infringing Plaintiff Grei's exclusive 19 rights of reproduction and public display under 17 U.S.C. §§ 106(1) and (5).

20 159. Linden Lab possesses the right and ability to supervise all conduct that occurs 21 within Second Life, including infringing conduct.

22 160. Linden Lab has a direct financial interest in the activities that have infringed 23 Plaintiff Grei's copyrighted materials. Linden Lab benefits directly from the infringement by 24 way of increased revenue derived from additional product uploads, virtual land rentals, and 25 additional currency exchanges.

27

28

161. Linden Lab's acts of infringement have been willful, intentional, and purposeful, in disregard of and indifferent to the rights of Plaintiff Grei.

162. As a direct and proximate result of Linden Lab's infringement of Plaintiff's copyrights and exclusive rights under copyright, Plaintiff Grei is entitled to the maximum statutory damages pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c). Alternatively, at Plaintiff's election, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), Plaintiff shall be entitled to her actual damages plus Linden Lab's profits from infringement, as will be proven at trial.

8 163. Plaintiff Grei is entitled to her costs, including reasonable attorneys' fees,
9 pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505.

10 164. Linden Lab's conduct is causing and, unless enjoined by this Court, will
11 continue to cause Plaintiff great and irreparable injury that cannot fully be compensated or
12 measured in money. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502,
13 Plaintiff Grei is entitled to a permanent injunction requiring Linden Lab to employ
14 reasonable methodologies to prevent or limit infringement of Plaintiff's copyrights.

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Cal. Bus. Prof. Code § 17200

(on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes)

165. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.

19 166. Section 17200 proscribes unfair business competition and defines this to
20 include any unfair, unlawful, or fraudulent business practice or act.

21 167. Linden Lab violated, and continues to violate this proscription through its
22 conduct alleged above, including its unlawful violations of the Lanham Act and the
23 Copyright Act.

Linden Lab, through its acts of unfair competition, has obtained money at the
expense of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs ask that this Court restore this money to them and enjoin
Linden Lab from continuing its illegal practices.

27 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

15

16

17

1	169. Such conduct is ongoing and continues to this date. Plaintiffs are therefore	
2	entitled to the relief described herein.	
3	TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION	
4	Violation of Cal. Bus. Prof. Code § 17500	
5	(on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes)	
6	170. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.	
7	171. Linden Lab violated, and continues to violate, this section by virtue of its	
8	practices described herein, including false advertising of counterfeit SexGen virtual products.	
9	172. Linden Lab, through its acts of unfair competition, has obtained money at the	
10	expense of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs ask that this Court restore this money to them and enjoin	
11	Linden Lab from continuing its illegal practices.	
12	173. Such conduct is ongoing and continues to this date. Plaintiffs are therefore	
13	entitled to the relief described herein.	
14	ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION	
	Intentional Interference with Economic Relations	
15	Intentional Interference with Economic Relations	
15 16	Intentional Interference with Economic Relations (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes)	
16	(on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes)	
16 17	(on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes)174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations.	
16 17 18	 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 175. Defendants' acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive 	
16 17 18 19	 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 175. Defendants' acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs of past and prospective economic and commercial opportunities to exploit their 	
16 17 18 19 20	 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 175. Defendants' acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs of past and prospective economic and commercial opportunities to exploit their intellectual property. 	
16 17 18 19 20 21	 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 175. Defendants' acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs of past and prospective economic and commercial opportunities to exploit their intellectual property. 176. A plaintiff seeking to recover for intentional interference with prospective 	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 175. Defendants' acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs of past and prospective economic and commercial opportunities to exploit their intellectual property. 176. A plaintiff seeking to recover for intentional interference with prospective contractual or economic relations under California law must prove that a defendant 	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 175. Defendants' acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs of past and prospective economic and commercial opportunities to exploit their intellectual property. 176. A plaintiff seeking to recover for intentional interference with prospective contractual or economic relations under California law must prove that a defendant knowingly interfered with Plaintiff's expectancy, and engaged in conduct that was wrongful 	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 175. Defendants' acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs of past and prospective economic and commercial opportunities to exploit their intellectual property. 176. A plaintiff seeking to recover for intentional interference with prospective contractual or economic relations under California law must prove that a defendant knowingly interfered with Plaintiff's expectancy, and engaged in conduct that was wrongful by some legal measure other than the fact of the interference itself. 	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 174. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 175. Defendants' acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive Plaintiffs of past and prospective economic and commercial opportunities to exploit their intellectual property. 176. A plaintiff seeking to recover for intentional interference with prospective contractual or economic relations under California law must prove that a defendant knowingly interfered with Plaintiff's expectancy, and engaged in conduct that was wrongful by some legal measure other than the fact of the interference itself. 177. Linden Lab, by its acts alleged herein, has knowingly, willfully and 	

1 business practices, and thereby knowingly interfered with Plaintiffs' expectancy in a manner 2 by engaging in conduct that was wrongful by legal measure or measures other than the fact of the interference itself. 3 4 178. Linden Lab is thereby liable to Plaintiffs for damages arising from their 5 actions 179. By reason of Linden Lab's acts, Plaintiffs' remedy at law is not adequate to 6 7 compensate it for the injuries inflicted by Linden Lab. 8 **TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION** 9 **Negligent Interference with Economic Relations** 10 (on behalf of all Plaintiffs and all Classes) 11 180. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations. 12 181. Linden Lab's acts alleged herein have deprived and continue to deprive 13 Plaintiffs of past and prospective economic and commercial opportunities to exploit their 14 intellectual property. 15 182. A plaintiff seeking to recover from negligent interference with prospective contractual or economic relations under California law must prove that a defendant knew, or 16 17 should have known, that its acts or omissions interfered with plaintiff's expectancy, thereby 18 engaging in conduct that it knew or should have known exhibited "disinterested 19 malevolence" and was wrongful by some legal measure other than the fact of the interference 20 itself. 21 183 Linden Lab, by its acts alleged herein, has knowingly, willfully and 22 intentionally engaged in primary and secondary copyright and trademark infringement, unfair 23 business practices, and thereby knowingly interfered with Plaintiffs' expectancy in a manner 24 by engaging in conduct that was wrongful by legal measure or measures other than the fact of 25 the interference itself. 26 184. Linden Lab is thereby liable to Plaintiffs for damages arising from its actions. 27 28 COMPLAINT 30

1	PRAYER FOR RELIEF	
2	WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs Eros, LLC and Ms. Grei, on behalf of themselves and the	
3	Classes, pray for the following relief:	
4	A. Certify this case as a class action on behalf of the Classes defined above;	
5	appoint Eros, LLC and Shannon Grei as class representatives; and appoint their counsel as	
6	class counsel;	
7	B. Declare that the actions of Linden Lab, as set out above, result in Trademark	
8	Infringement, False Designation of Origin Trademark Infringement, Contributory Trademark	
9	Infringement, Vicarious Trademark Infringement, Intentional Interference with Economic	
10	Relations, Negligent Interference with Economic Relations, and violate Cal. Bus. & Prof.	
11	Code §§ 17200 and 17500;	
12	C. Enter judgment against Linden Lab for all statutory damages authorized by	
13	the Lanham Act, or, at Plaintiff's choosing, Linden Lab's profits, the costs of the action, and	
14	actual damages caused by its conduct and, to the extent authorized under the Lanham Act,	
15	treble damages;	
16	D. Enter judgment against Linden Lab for all statutory damages authorized by	
17	the Copyright Act, or, at Plaintiff's choosing, actual damages caused by its conduct;	
18	E. Award restitution against Linden Lab for all money to which Plaintiffs and the	
19	Classes are entitled in equity;	
20	F. Award Plaintiffs and the Classes their reasonable litigation expenses and	
21	attorneys' fees, as authorized by the Lanham Act and the Copyright Act;	
22	G. Award Plaintiffs and the Classes pre- and post-judgment interest, to the extent	
23	allowable;	
24	H. Enter injunctive and/or declaratory relief as is necessary to protect the	
25	interests of Plaintiffs and the Classes; and	
26	I. Award such other and further relief as equity and justice may require.	
27		
28	COMPLAINT	
	31	

JURY TRIAL 1 Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury for all issues so triable. 2 3 Respectfully submitted, 4 Dated: September <u>/</u>, 2009 KAMBEREDELSON, LLC 5 6 By: ALAN HIMMELFARB 7 One of the Attorneys for Plaintiffs 8 ALAN HIMMELFARB - SBN 90480 9 KAMBEREDELSON, LLC 2757 Leonis Boulevard 10 Vernon, California 90058 Telephone: (323) 585-8696 11 STEVEN W. TEPPLER 12 MICHAEL J. ASCHENBRENER 13 KAMBEREDELSON, LLC 350 N. LaSalle St. 14 Suite 1300 Chicago, IL 60654 15 Telephone: (312) 589-6370 Fax: (312) 589-6378 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 COMPLAINT 32