Case 2:10-cv-01019-CAS-JEM Document 1 Filed 02/11/10 Page 1 of 22 Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney.com FILED KING, HOLMES, PATERNO & BERLINER LLP Howard E. King, Esq., State Bar No. 077012 HOWARD E. KING, ESQ., STATE BAR NO. 132514
STEPHEN D. ROTHSCHILD, ESQ., STATE BAR NO. 132514
10 FEB 11 PM 2: 01 ROTHSCHILD@KHPBLAW.COM 1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS, 25TH FLOOR CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES Los Angeles, California 90067-4506 Telephone: (310) 282-8989 Facsimile: (310) 282-8903 ·8Y:_ 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff ANDRE YOUNG pka DR. DRE 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 CASENO.CV 10-01019-CASUAN ANDRE YOUNG pka DR. DRE, an individual, 12 **COMPLAINT** for Plaintiff, Breach of Contract 13 False Advertising Trademark Infringement Trademark Dilution 14 VS. Misappropriation of Common Law WIDEAWAKE DEATH ROW ENTERTAINMENT LLC, a limited liability company; WIDEAWAKE ENTERTAINMENT GROUP, INC., a Right of Publicity Violation of California Civil Code 16 Section 3344 corporation; WIDEAWAKE HOLDING COMPANY, INC., a corporation; and Unfair Competition 17 8) Constructivê Trust DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, 18 DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL 19 Defendants. 20 21 Plaintiff Andre Young p/k/a Dre ("Dr. Dre" or "plaintiff") hereby alleges as 22 follows: Plaintiff is an internationally renowned and immensely popular 23 1. composer, producer, recording artist and performer, with an excellent reputation 24 25 among the public and the critical community for his music. His critically acclaimed 26 and commercially successful works include his classic debut solo album "Dr. Dre The Chronic" ("The Chronic"), released in or about November 1992 on the record label he co-founded, Death Row Records, Inc. ("Death Row"). 1828.115/314741.2

- 2. Dr. Dre made a well-publicized escape from Death Row in 1996, leaving the record label with limited rights to continue to exploit *The Chronic*, and no other Dr. Dre recordings, subject to the obligation of Death Row to pay royalties for use of those rights. From 1996 until Death Row's descent into bankruptcy, not a dime of royalties had been paid.
- 3. In 2009, Death Row's music catalogue, including rights and obligations relating to *The Chronic*, was transferred through a federal bankruptcy proceeding to WIDEawake Entertainment, a purchaser that promised a new era of Death Row Records actually paying royalties to its artists and honoring its other commitments.
- 4. Specifically, the CEO of the supposedly new and improved Death Row Records stated: "I don't think anyone could do as bad as the last guy. Failure to provide royalties and whatever craziness went on, that's not my way. It's ethically wrong. I can't do that," promised Lara Levi, CEO of WIDEawake Entertainment.
- 5. Notwithstanding the rhetoric, this was another example of "meet the new boss, same as the old boss." Dr. Dre has <u>never</u> been paid, either by Defendants or their predecessors. Defendants have also released to the public a Dr. Dre album entitled *The Chronic Re-Lit*, as well as a "Greatest Hits" album, without authorization. Neither Defendants nor their predecessors have honored a word of their agreements with Dr. Dre. This lawsuit is to make sure that Defendants don't forget about Dre.
- 6. Whether you get thugged or the check just doesn't come, it's all the same someone else has your money. And whether it's a platitude-spouting, self-proclaimed soccer mom or a supposed gangster who isn't paying you, it doesn't change the fact that you're not getting paid.
- 7. "Things just ain't the same for gangsters ... I've seen them come, I've watched them go ... watched the lawsuits when they lost the dough ... I just sit back and watch the show ..." Dr. Dre, plaintiff.

THE PARTIES

|| (

- 8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant WIDEawake Holding Company Inc. ("WHC") is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Canada, with its principal place of business in Toronto, Canada.
- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant WIDEawake Entertainment Group Inc. ("WEG") is a business entity with its principal place of business in Toronto, Canada; that WHC owns and controls WEG; and that WHC conducts business through and as WEG.
- 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant WIDEawake Death Row Entertainment LLC ("WDRE") is a business entity with its principal place of business in Toronto, Canada; that WHC and WEG own and control WDRE; and that WHC and WEG conduct business through and as WDRE.
- 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Lara Lavi ("Lavi") is an individual residing in Toronto, Canada and a citizen of the State of Washington; formerly an attorney practicing in the State of Washington with expertise in intellectual property, publicity and contractual rights such as those at issue herein; and the Chief Executive Officer and an owner of WHC, WEG and/or WDRE.
- 12. Plaintiff sues Does 1 through 10, inclusive, herein under fictitious names. Plaintiff does not know their true names and capacities. When plaintiff ascertains the Doe defendants' true names and capacities, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. On information and belief each defendant named herein as a Doe acted with the other defendants and is responsible for the damages to plaintiff herein alleged. Each reference in this complaint to defendants, or to any of them, also refers to all defendants sued under fictitious names.

11///

- WEG were the alter egos of WHC, and there exists and has existed at all times material herein a unity of interest and ownership between and among them, such that any separateness between or among them has ceased to exist, and WDRE and WEG are mere shells, instrumentalities, and conduits through which WHC and Lavi have at all times material herein carried out their business, exercising complete control and dominance over them such that any individuality or separateness between or among them has ceased to exist.
- 14. WGC, WEG and WDRE are referred to collectively hereinafter as "defendants".
- 15. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of WHC, WEG and WDRE as entities distinct from each other would permit an abuse of the corporate privilege and would sanction fraud and promote injustice.
- 16. On information and belief at all times material herein each of the defendants was the agent and employee of the other defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

U.S.C. § 1331 in that plaintiff seeks relief against defendants under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114 et seq., and pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over any claims arising under state law because those claims are so related to the claims in the action within the Court's original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution. This Court also has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1332(a)(1) and (2) because the instant action is between citizens of a State and citizens or subjects of a foreign state and/or of a different State and the amount in controversy exceeds

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

Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney.com

\$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs.

Venue. Venue lies within this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 18. 1391(b)(2) because a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to plaintiff's claims alleged herein occurred in this district; and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1391(d), because three of the defendants herein are aliens.

FACTS APPLICABLE TO ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

- A. Formation of Death Row and the 1991 Agreement, and Plaintiff's Recordings with Death Row Including The Chronic
- In 1991, plaintiff and non-party Marion "Suge" Knight ("Knight") 19. founded Death Row to produce phono records in the rap music genre. Plaintiff initially held a 50% ownership interest in Death Row.
- 20. In 1991 and 1992, plaintiff created, produced, and was the principal performer on all master recordings embodied on The Chronic.
- Prior to March 14, 1996, plaintiff also produced, and composed and 21. performed on, songs appearing on other Death Row-released sound recordings in addition to The Chronic, including, but not limited to, the albums Doggystyle, Above the Rim and Murder Was the Case, the 2Pac song "California Love," and others (collectively, the "Dre Recordings").
- 22. When plaintiff and Knight formed Death Row in 1991, plaintiff orally and impliedly granted Death Row a non-exclusive license to release sound recordings that he produced, composed and/or performed on in exchange for Death Row's payment to him of applicable artist's royalties, mechanical royalties, and producer royalties in amounts commensurate with his status in the music industry, except as the parties might otherwise agree (the "1991 Agreement").

В. The 1992 Agreement

In or about Fall 1992, plaintiff granted Death Row a non-exclusive 23. license to distribute *The Chronic* in exchange for Death Row's agreement to pay him a royalty of 18% of the suggested retail price on all copies sold of The Chronic

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

Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney.com

("The Chronic Royalties") (the "1992 Agreement").

24. As part of the 1992 Agreement, Death Row also agreed to pay plaintiff a royalty of 4% of the suggested list retail price of all sound recordings that plaintiff produced for artists signed to Death Row (the "Producer Royalties").

C. The 1996 Agreement

- On or about March 14, 1996, plaintiff, Knight and Death Row entered 25. into a written agreement (the "1996 Agreement"), a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "1" and incorporated herein by reference, pursuant to which:
 - Plaintiff relinquished his 50% ownership interest in Death Row;
- b. Plaintiff quitclaimed to Death Row his copyrights in sound recordings previously released by Death Row, including *The Chronic* and the Dre Recordings (the "Copyrights"), subject to the condition that "unless the parties hereto otherwise agree in writing, the foregoing master recordings shall only be distributed in the manners heretofore distributed;" and
- Death Row agreed to pay plaintiff The Chronic Royalties, the Producer Royalties, and all other royalties due and to become due to him from and after January 1, 1996 under the 1991 and 1992 Agreements, or otherwise.
- Pursuant to the 1992 and 1996 Agreements, plaintiff relinquished to 26. Death Row the master recordings and copyrights of *The Chronic*, *Doggystyle*, Murder Was the Case and Above the Rim, and the other Dre Recordings theretofore released by Death Row (collectively, the "Copyrights").
- 27. The 1996 Agreement effected the transfer of the Copyrights to Death Row. At the same time, it strictly circumscribed the ways in which Death Row was permitted to exploit the *The Chronic*. Such terms are consistent with custom and practice in the music industry. They allow the parties to complete a copyright transfer, while prohibiting certain types of future exploitation or deferring negotiations over particular uses of the copyright that the transferor, at the time of the transaction, wishes to control. If the transferee desires to engage in such uses in

the future, it must negotiate with the transferor for them at that time. Such terms are critical to artists because they enable the artists to retain control over how, when and the terms pursuant to which their creative output is presented to the public.

- 28. At the time of the 1996 Agreement, *The Chronic* and the Dre Recordings had been distributed on vinyl records, cassette audiotapes and compact discs, with the same artwork, recordings, masters and mixes as their earlier releases, and in no other manner, medium or configuration. Specifically, Death Row had no rights to distribute *The Chronic* digitally or in any other configuration.
 - D. The Death Row Bankruptcy and Defendant's Acquisition of The Copyrights Subject to the 1991, 1992 and 1996 Agreements
- 29. In or about April 2006, Death Row filed for bankruptcy protection in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Act.
- 30. On or about January 15, 2009, at an auction at the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California, defendants purchased Death Row and its assets, including the copyrights to *The Chronic* and the other Dre Recordings, subject to the 1991, 1992 and 1996 Agreements and the conditions and limitations therein.
 - E. Plaintiff's Notice to Defendants of the Conditions and Limitations in the Agreements between Dr. Dre and Death Row, and Defendants' Subsequent Release of "Re-Lit" in Intentional Violation of Plaintiff's Rights
- 31. In Spring 2009, including, but not limited to, in telephone conversations and personal meeting with and in a detailed June 16, 2009 email to Lavi, plaintiff's counsel expressly and specifically notified defendants of their contractual obligations to plaintiff, including that the 1996 Agreement prohibited defendants from releasing *The Chronic* in any manner in which it was not distributed prior to the 1996 Agreement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- 32. Plaintiff is informed and believes that defendants were already aware of those limitations including, but not limited to, as a result of their due diligence before purchasing the Death Row assets.
- 33. Among other things, plaintiff notified defendants, in writing, that the 1996 Agreement prohibited defendants from digitally distributing or recompiling The Chronic or licensing any of the recordings thereon for use by third parties. Defendants also reminded defendants that, as they already knew, they had no right to use plaintiff's name, likeness, voice or performances (other than as specifically allowed under the 1996 Agreement) for any purpose.
- In the June 16, 2009 email, plaintiff proposed terms under which he 34. would permit defendants to exploit *The Chronic* in manners beyond those permitted under the 1996 Agreement, including to digitally distribute the album.
 - 35. Defendants ignored plaintiff's proposal.
- 36. On or about August 31, 2009, defendants released and commenced distributing and selling throughout North America, including, but not limited to, in this District, an album and DVD entitled The Chronic Re-Lit & From the Vault ("Re-Lit").
- 37. Re-Lit and defendants' exploitation of it, perpetrated after attorney Lavi received actual notice of plaintiff's rights and his non-consent to any such use, is a brazen disregard of plaintiff's intellectual property rights; a calculated breach of the 1996 Agreement; a willful violation of plaintiff's rights to his name and likeness, and his trademark, "Dr. Dre" (the "Mark"); and a fraud on the public, including, but not limited to, as follows:
- Re-Lit uses The Chronic to foist on an unsuspecting public an a. unauthorized version of The Chronic, miscellaneous advertisements, and sound recordings that plaintiff did not endorse.
- Without plaintiff's permission, the cover of *Re-Lit* consists b. almost entirely of plaintiff's Mark, name and likeness, in an effort to fool the public

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25 26

Defendants have also breached the 1996 Agreement by digitally 39. distributing The Chronic.

27

28

///

3. Inclusion of Dre Recordings in More than One "Greatest Hits" or "Best of" Album

- 40. Since acquiring Death Row defendants have continued to sell and distribute a compilation album entitled *Death Row's Greatest Hits* which included several of the sound recordings from *The Chronic*, such as "Nuthin' but a G Thang," "Let Me Ride," "Lil' Ghetto Boy," and "Stranded on Death Row." That album constituted the one Death Row "Greatest Hits" or "Best of" album permitted under the 1996 Agreement.
- 41. In breach of the 1996 Agreement, defendants have also continued to distribute the following Death Row albums that contain plaintiff's sound recordings from *The Chronic* in violation of the 1996 Agreement in the following additional "greatest hits" type packages (collectively, the "Unauthorized Greatest Hit Packages"):
- a. The Very Best of Death Row, which includes "Nuthin' But a G' Thang" and "Let Me Ride" from The Chronic;
- b. 15 Years on Death Row, which includes "Nuthin' but a G Thang," "Let Me Ride" and "Lil' Ghetto Boy" from The Chronic; and Chronicles: Death Row Classics;
- c. The Death Row Singles Collection, which includes "Nuthin' But a G Thang," and "Let Me Ride"; and
- d. Dr. Dre Chronicles Deluxe: Death Row Classics, which includes "Nuthin But a G Thang" and "Let Me Ride," unauthorized videos featuring plaintiff's performances and sound recordings, and the wrongful, unauthorized use of plaintiff's name and likeness.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Breach of Contract Against All Defendants)

42. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 41, inclusive above, as though fully set forth.

- 43. Plaintiff performed all conditions, covenants and promises required on his part to be performed under the 1991, 1992 and 1996 Agreements, except those that were waived or that were rendered impossible to perform.
- 44. Defendants have breached the 1991, 1992 and 1996 Agreements by releasing and distributing *The Chronic* and the other Dre Recordings in manners in which they had not been released or distributed as of the date of the 1996 Agreement; and by failing and refusing to account for and pay any of the royalties due plaintiff under the Agreements.
- 45. As a result of defendants' breaches of the 1991, 1992 and 1996 Agreements plaintiff has suffered damages including, but not limited to, unpaid royalties, lost sales of Dre Recordings, and harm to his reputation, all in an amount to be proved at trial, but which plaintiff is informed and believes is in excess of \$75,000, plus interest at the legal rate.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(False Advertising -- Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)
Against All Defendants)

- 46. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 45, inclusive above, as though fully set forth.
- 47. Plaintiff is the registered owner of the "Dr. Dre" Mark, Registration numbers Nos. 2275314, 2271448, 2271449, and 2271450 (the "Mark").
- 48. Defendants' use of the Mark and of plaintiff's name and likeness on and in connection with the marketing, distribution, and sale of *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hit Packages, and in promoting itself and other merchandise, is and was likely to, intended to, did, and will continue to confuse and mislead the public and misrepresent and create the false impression that the *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages were authorized, approved, endorsed, sponsored, connected or affiliated with plaintiff.

28 || / / /

49.	Plaintiff never authorized, approved, endorsed, or sponsored Re-Lit or				
the Unauthorized Greatest Hit Packages and never authorized, approved, or					
consented to defendants' use of his name, likeness, or Mark on or in connection with					
them, or at	all, except as narrowly permitted in the 1996 Agreement.				

- 50. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff has been damaged and will continue to be damaged in an amount to be proven at trial.
- 51. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §§ 1116(a), 1118, and 1125(a), plaintiffs is entitled to an Order enjoining defendants from marketing, distributing, or selling *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hit Packages and impounding and destroying all copies of and marketing materials pertaining to them.
- 52. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), plaintiff is entitled to an Order: (a) requiring defendants to account for and pay to plaintiffs all profits derived by defendant from their conduct alleged herein, to be increased according to applicable provisions of law, and (b) awarding all damages sustained by plaintiff and caused by defendants.
- 53. Defendants' conduct alleged herein was intentional, egregious, and without foundation in law and, therefore, under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a) plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages against defendants, and each of them.
- 54. Defendants' acts make this an exceptional case under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), thereby entitling plaintiff to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Trademark Infringement—Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114 Against All Defendants)

- 55. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 54, inclusive above, as though fully set forth.
- 56. Without plaintiff's permission or consent, defendants have engaged in the unauthorized use in commerce of reproductions, counterfeits, copies and/or imitations of plaintiff's registered trademarks in connection with defendants'

advertising, distribution, offering for sale, and sales of *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages, and in their promotion of their business and other merchandise.

- 57. Defendants' unauthorized use of plaintiff's trademarks in commerce on and in connection with *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages, and in their promotion of themselves and their other merchandise, is and was likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive the public, as described above, in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1). Defendants have committed these acts with the knowledge and intent that their use of plaintiff's trademarks would cause confusion, deception, or mistake.
- 58. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' willful infringing conduct as described above, plaintiffs have been damaged and will continue to be damaged in amounts to be proven at trial. Defendants' infringing conduct entitles plaintiff to recover his actual damages, trebled, together with defendants' profits, and plaintiff's attorney fees and costs.
- 59. Plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction to prevent future infringing conduct and to the seizure and return of all copies of *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages, and all promotional, advertising, marketing and other material related thereto.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Trademark Dilution-- Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c) Against All Defendants)

- 60. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 59, inclusive above, as though fully set forth.
- 61. Plaintiff's Mark is a famous and extremely recognizable and distinctive mark used in interstate commerce in the United States. Defendants began selling *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages after the Mark was famous.

///

- 62. Defendants' use of the Mark on and in connection with *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hit Packages, and in their promotion of their business and other merchandise, is likely to dilute and detract from the distinctiveness of the Mark with resulting damage to plaintiff and to the substantial business and goodwill symbolized by the Mark.
- 63. Defendants' conduct in marketing, distributing, and selling *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hit Packages, and in their promotion of their business and other merchandise, is and was willfully intended to trade on plaintiff's reputation or to cause dilution of the Mark, and hence plaintiff is entitled to damages and other remedies under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2) and to a permanent injunction to prevent future infringing conduct.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Misappropriation of Common Law Right of Publicity Against All Defendants)

- 64. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 63, inclusive above, as though fully set forth.
- 65. By using plaintiff's name and likeness on and in connection with *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hit Packages, and in defendants' promotion of their business and other merchandise, without authority or permission from plaintiff, defendants are and have been improperly trading on plaintiff's fame, recognition, and goodwill in order to sell defendants' products in violation of plaintiff's rights as the owner of his common law rights of publicity for merchandise. Defendants have misappropriated plaintiff's name and likeness for their benefit and commercial advantage, without permission or consent from plaintiff, and without compensating plaintiff for such use.
- 66. Plaintiff has been damaged by defendants' misappropriation of his common law rights of publicity in and to his name and likeness in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

PATERNO

- 67. Plaintiff seeks temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief in order to stop any further violations of plaintiff's rights of publicity.
- 68. Defendants acted with willful and conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights and interests, with the intent to benefit defendants, and each of them, and with the intent to defraud plaintiff and deprive him of his rights, thereby entitling plaintiff to an award of punitive damages against defendants in order to punish defendants and to deter similar misconduct in the future.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Violation of California Civil Code Section 3344

Against All Defendants)

- 69. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 68, inclusive above, as though fully set forth.
- 70. Defendants are and at all relevant times have been knowingly using plaintiff's name and likeness for their commercial advantage on and in connection with *Re-Lit*, the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages, and in promoting itself and its other merchandise, without plaintiff's permission or consent, including to advertise and market *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages and to promote their business and to solicit sales of those albums and other merchandise. There is a direct connection between defendants' unauthorized use of the plaintiff's name and likeness and defendants' commercial purpose in promoting sales of the *Re-Lit* and the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages, as well as in promoting defendants' business and their sales of other merchandise.
- 71. Plaintiff has been damaged and will continue to be damaged by defendants' unauthorized use of plaintiff's name and likeness in an amount according to proof, including statutory damages under California Civil Code section 3344, as applicable, or plaintiffs' actual damages, whichever are greater, plus defendants' profits from their unauthorized use of plaintiff's name and likeness.

///

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12

10

13

14

15 16

18 19

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney.com

Defendants acted with willful and conscious disregard of plaintiff's 72. rights and interests, with the intent to benefit defendants, and each of them, and with the intent to defraud plaintiff and deprive him of his rights, thereby entitling plaintiff to an award of punitive damages against defendants in order to punish defendants and to deter similar misconduct in the future.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Unfair Competition, California Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. Against All Defendants)

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 73. 72, inclusive above, as though fully set forth.
- Defendants' wrongful acts described herein constitute unlawful, unfair, 74. and fraudulent business practices and misleading advertising under California Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq.
- Plaintiff has been damaged and will continue to be damaged by 75. Defendants' unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices and misleading advertising, as described above.
- Plaintiff is entitled to an injunction prohibiting defendants from 76. continuing the practices described above, and to restitution of all amounts acquired by defendants by means of their acts of unfair competition.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Constructive Trust Against All Defendants)

- Plaintiff realleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 76, inclusive 77. above, as though fully set forth.
- By virtue of their wrongful conduct, defendants illegally received 78. money and profits that rightfully belonged to plaintiff. Defendants are therefore involuntary trustees, holding the gross receipts from their sales and revenues to the extent attributable to their wrongful exploitation of Re-Lit, the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages, the Mark, and plaintiff's name and likeness. Defendants

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hold such moneys and funds on behalf of and subject to a first and prior lien against all others and in favor of plaintiff. Upon information and belief, defendants hold this illegally received money and profits in the form of bank accounts, real property, and personal property that can be located and traced. Plaintiff is entitled to the remedy of a constructive trust in view of defendants' wrongful conduct alleged hereinabove.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment, as follows:

- For damages according to proof, plus interest at the legal rate; 1.
- 2. For temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining defendants
- (a) (i) from marketing, distributing, or selling Re-Lit and the Unauthorized Greatest Hits Packages; (ii) impounding and/or requiring the destruction of all copies of and marketing, promotional and other materials related to them; (iii) requiring defendants to turn over to plaintiff all books and records, including, but not limited to, all distribution and other agreements, accountings, royalty and other statements, sales and distribution records, and all other things and materials related to them; and (iv) requiring defendants to pay over to plaintiff all monies and other things of value received on account of sales, distribution and/or any other exploitation of them;
- From any further use of the Mark and of plaintiff's name and (b) likeness and any other violations of plaintiff's rights of publicity;
 - 5. For an accounting;
 - 6. For a constructive trust;
 - 7. For treble damages;
 - For punitive damages; 8.

26

III

27

III

28

Case 2:10-cv-01019-CAS-JEM Document 1 Filed 02/11/10 Page 18 of 22 Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney.com For costs and attorney fees incurred herein; and 9. 1 For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 10. 2 3 DATED: February 10, 2010 KING, HOLMES, PATERNO & BERLINER, LLP 4 5 By: 6 Howard E. King Attorneys for Plaintiff ANDRE YOUNG p/k/a/DR. DRE 7 8 9 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 10 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues triable to a jury. 11 12 KING, HOLMES, PATERNO & BERLINER, LLP DATED: February 10, 2010 13 14 By:_ HOWARD E. 15 Attorneys for Plaintiff ANDRE YOUNG p/k/a/DŘ. DŘE 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 1828.115/314741.2 18

KING, HOLMES, PATERNO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Christina A. Snyder and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is John E. McDermott.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV10- 1019 CAS (JEMx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.
All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge
NOTICE TO COUNSEL
A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).
Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:
[X] Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516 Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501
Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Case 2:10-cv-01019-CAS-JEM Docu	ment 1 Filed 02/11/10 Page 20 of 22
Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney.com	
	DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
ANDRE YOUNG pka DR. DRE, an individual	CASE NUMBER
PLAINTIFF(S) V.	CV10-01019-CAS CYEMAS
WIDEAWAKE DEATH ROW ENTERTAINMENT LLC, a limited liability company; WIDEAWAKE ENTERTAINMENT GROUP, INC., a corporation, WIDEAWAKE HOLDING COMPANY, INC., a corporation, DEFENDANT(S). and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive	SUMMONS
TO: DEFENDANT(S): NAMED ABOVE	<u> </u>
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached X counterclaim cross-claim or a motion under Rul or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney,	le 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer , whose address is . If you fail to do so,
your answer or motion with the court.	Tener demander in the complaint. Tou also must me
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
Dated: 11 FEB 2010	By: MARILYN DAVIS Deputy Clerk
	(Seal of the Court)
[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United Stat 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	es agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed
CV-01A (12/07) SUM	MONS
• •	CCD-1A

Case 2:10-cv-01019-CAS-JEM Document 1 Filed 02/11/10 Page 21 of 22

UNITED STATE. DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICA & CALIFORNIA Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney@@cover sheet I (a) PLAINTIFFS. (Check box if you are representing yourself ____) DEFENDANTS ANDRE YOUNG pka DR. DRE, an individual WIDEAWAKE DEATH ROW ENTERTAINMENT LLC, a limited liability company; WIDEAWAKE ENTERTAINMENT GROUP, INC., a corporation, WIDEAWAKE HOLDING COMPANY, INC., a corporation and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive (b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing Attorneys (If Known) yourself, provide same.) Howard E. King, Esq. King, Holmes, Paterno & Berliner, LLP 1900 Avenue of the Stars 25th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067 (310) 282-8989 ш. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.) (Place an X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.) DEF DEF 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Incorporated or Principal Place] 4 □] 4 Citizen of This State of Business in this State Government Not a Party) Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship 2 U.S. Government Defendant of Business in Another State of Parties in Item III) □ 6 □ 6 Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation Foreign Country ORIGIN (Place an X in one box only.) Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from another district 6 Multi- 7 Appeal to District X 1 Original 2 Removed from 3 District Judge from Appellate Court Reopened (specify): State Court Proceeding Litigation Magistrate Judge REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: JURY DEMAND: X Yes No (Check 'Yes' only if demanded in complaint.) CLASS ACTION under F.R.C.P. 23: Yes X No MONEY DEMANDED IN COMPLAINT: \$ subject to proof CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) Infringement of plaintiff's trademark 28 USC Section 1331. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an X in one box only.) 4.65 3.30 : (€)(£) OMERCIA STRAIGHTES PERSONA 竞赛节 指金字符 710 Fair Labor 110 Insurance 400 State Reapportionment Parting and Standards Act 310 Airolane 510 Motions to 120 Marine 410 Antitrust Labor/Mgmt. 370 Other Fraud Vacate Sentence 315 Airplane Product 430 Banks and Banking 130 Miller Act Relations Habeas Corpus 371 Truth in Lending 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability 450 Commerce/ICC 730 Labor/Mgmt. 320 Assault, Libel & 380 Other Personal 530 General Rates/etc. 150 Recovery of Reporting & Slander Property Damage 535 Death Penalty 460 Deportation Overpayment & Disclosure Act 330 Fed. Employers' Enforcement of 540 Mandamus/ 385 Property Damage 470 Racketeer Influenced 740 Railway Labor Act Liability Judgment and Corrupt Product Liability Other 340 Marine Organizations 151 Medicare Act 550 Civil Rights 790 Other Labor 345 Marine Product 3480 Consumer Credit 152 Recovery of Defaulted Litigation 555 Prison Condition Liability 422 Appeal 28 USC Student Loan (Excl. 490 Cable/Sat TV iko ku kun sela 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 350 Motor Vehicle 158 Veterans) 3810 Selective Service Security Act 355 Motor Vehicle 423 Withdrawal 28 ☐ 153 Recovery of 350 Securities/Commodities TO REST **Product Liability** 610 Agriculture Overpayment of Exchange 360 Other Personal 620 Other Food & 820 Copyrights Veteran's Benefits 375 Customer Challenge 12 441 Voting 830 Patent Injury Drug 160 Stockholders' Suits USC 3410 625 Drug Related 840 Trademark 362 Personal Injury-442 Employment 190 Other Contract 890 Other Statutory Actions Med Malpractice 443 Housing/Acco-Seizure of 195 Contract Product Property 21 USC 365 Personal Injurymmodations 861 HIA (1395ff) 891 Agricultural Act Liability 892 Economic Stabilization Product Liability 444 Welfare 881 862 Black Lung (923) 196 Franchise 🗔 368 Asbestos Personal Act 445 American with 630 Liquor Laws 863 DIWC/DIWW Para Proprie Injury Product Disabilities -640 R.R. & Truck (405(g))■893 Environmental Matters Liability Employment 650 Airline Regs 864 SSID Title XVI 210 Land Condemnation 894 Energy Allocation Act JEC YEAR IN 865 RSI (405(g)) 446 American with 660 Occupational 895 Freedom of Info. Act 220 Foreclosure 100 V Disabilities -Safety/Health 900 Appeal of Fee Determi-230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 462 Naturalization Other 690 Other 870 Taxes (U.S. nation Under Equal Application 240 Torts to Land Plaintiff or Access to Justice 245 Tort Product Liability Habeas Corpus-440 Other Civil Defendant) Alien Detainee Rights J950 Constitutionality of 290 All Other Real Property 465 Other Immigration State Statutes 871 IRS - Third Party 26 USC 7609 Actions FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

Case 2:10-cv-01019-CAS-JEM Document 1 Filed 02/11/10 Page 22 of 22 UNITED STAT: DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRIC F CALIFORNIA

Hosted on www.iptrademarkattorney.com

HUSIEU UH WWV	•	•		
	S: Has this action	been previously filed in this	court and dismissed, remanded or closed? X No Yes	
If yes, list case number(s):		1 -1 201- 3 1 411	purt that are related to the present case? X No Yes	
	Have any cases be	en previously filed in this co	purt that are related to the present case? X No Yes	
If yes, list case number(s):				
Civil cases are deemed related				
(Check all boxes that apply)			ated transactions, happenings, or events; or	
3			or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or	
			stantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or	
			k or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.	
IX. VENUE: (When completing				
			State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides.	
Check here if the govern	ment, its agencies	or employees is a named pla	intiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).	
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
Los Angeles			_	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
(b) List the County in this Dist	rict; California Cou	inty outside of this District;	State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides.	
			fendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).	
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
			All Defendants - Canada	
(-) List the County is this Dist	riot: California Cou	unty outside of this District	State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.	
		e location of the tract of la		
	ation cases, use th	c totalion of the trace of h	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country	
County in this District:*			Cantolina County Guideo of Ann Shorton, Cantol in County and Cantolina County	
Los Angeles				
* I as Angeles Orange Sen Re	rnardina Rivarsi	de Ventura Santa Barbar	a, or San Luis Obispo Counties	
Note: In land condemnation case				
11010. 11 1410 0011111111111111111111111	.,			
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORN	EY (OR PRO PER		Date <u>February 10, 2010</u>	
		Howard E. Ki	ng (\	
or other papers as required by	law. This form, a	oproved by the Judicial Conf	information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings because of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)	
Key to Statistical codes relating	to Social Security (Cases:		
•				
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement o	f Cause of Action	
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))		
862 ·	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)		
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))		
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))		
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.		
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. (g))		
CV-71 (05/08)		CIV	IL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2	