

1 Hubert H. Kuo (CA Bar No. 204036)  
David Yu (CA Bar No. 276471)  
2 Caixing Ma (CA Bar No. 323142)  
ARDENT LAW GROUP, PC  
3 4340 Von Karman Ave., Suite 290  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
4 Telephone: (949) 299-0188  
Facsimile: (949) 299-0127

5 Attorneys for Plaintiff FLUMGIO TECHNOLOGY  
6 INC., a California corporation

7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
8 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SOUTHERN DIVISION**

10 FLUMGIO TECHNOLOGY, INC., a  
California corporation;  
11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13 LA CARBONELLA WHOLESALE,  
14 a California corporation; M MUTAZ  
15 AL AYOUN ALDABBAGH, an  
16 individual, and DOES 1 through 10,  
inclusive.

17 Defendants.  
18

Case No.

Assigned to Hon. Judge  
Courtroom:

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:**

- 1. **FEDERAL TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT UNDER 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114;**
- 2. **FEDERAL UNFAIR COMPETITION AND FALSE ADVERTISING UNDER 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a);**
- 3. **COMMON LAW TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT;**
- and
- 4. **UNFAIR COMPETITION AND FALSE ADVERTISING UNDER CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200 AND 17500, ET SEQ.**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

22 Plaintiff FLUMGIO TECHNOLOGY, INC., a California corporation, for  
23 causes of action against named Defendants LA CARBONELLA WHOLESALE., a  
24 California corporation and M MUTAZ AL AYOUN ALDABBAGH, an individual  
25 (collectively “DEFENDANTS”), complain and allege as follows:

26 //  
27 //  
28 //

**THE PARTIES**

1  
2 1. Plaintiff FLUMGIO TECHNOLOGY, INC. (“PLAINTIFF” and/or  
3 “FLUMGIO”) is a California corporation, located at 14748 Nelson Ave., Unit C,  
4 City of Industry, CA 91744.

5 2. Defendant LA CARBONELLA WHOLESALE (“LCW”) is a California  
6 corporation, with its principal place of business located at 10605 Lawson River  
7 Ave., Fountain Valley, CA 92708.

8 3. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that  
9 Defendant M MUTAZ AL AYOUN ALDABBAGH (“ALDABBAGH”) is at  
10 various times mentioned herein is an officer, director or agent of Defendant LCW  
11 and a resident of the County of Orange.

12 4. Hereafter, LCW and ALDABBAGH may at times collectively be  
13 referred as DEFENDANTS.

14 5. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate,  
15 or otherwise, of the defendants named herein as DOES 1 through 25 inclusive, are  
16 unknown to PLAINTIFF who therefore sue said defendants by such fictitious names  
17 pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure § 474. PLAINTIFF will amend this  
18 Complaint to show their true names and capacities when the same have been  
19 ascertained.

20 6. PLAINTIFF is informed and believe, and thereon allege that at all times  
21 relevant to this action each of the DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 through 25  
22 inclusive, were responsible in some manner for the acts and omissions alleged in this  
23 Complaint, and that PLAINTIFF’S damages, both existing and prospective, are,  
24 were, and will be proximately caused by the acts and omissions of the  
25 DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 through 25 inclusive.

26 7. Based upon information and belief, PLAINTIFF alleges there exists,  
27 and at all times herein mentioned there existed, a unity of interest and ownership  
28 between ALDABBAGH, on the one hand, and LCW on the other hand, such that

1 any individual and separateness between ALDABBAGH, on the one hand, and  
2 LCW, on the other hand, have ceased to exist, and ALDABBAGH is the alter ego of  
3 LCW in that LCW is, and at all times herein mentioned was a mere shell,  
4 instrumentality and conduit through which ALDABBAGH carried on his business  
5 and were so inadequately capitalized that, compared with the business to be done by  
6 LCW, and the risks of loss, its capitalization was illusory. ALDABBAGH  
7 completely controlled, dominated, managed and operated LCW and commingled the  
8 assets of each to suit the convenience of ALDABBAGH and to evade payment of  
9 the obligations owed to creditors of LCW.

10 8. Adherence to the fiction of the separate existence of ALDABBAGH,  
11 on the one hand, and LCW, on the other hand, would permit an abuse of the  
12 corporate privilege and would sanction fraud and promote injustice in that  
13 ALDABBAGH have perpetrated fraudulent acts in the names of LCW and never  
14 taken the steps to maintain the corporate standing of LCW.

#### 15 **VENUE AND JURISDICTION**

16 9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this Complaint pursuant to  
17 15 U.S.C. § 1051 *et seq.* (Lanham Act), 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) (trademark) and 28  
18 U.S.C. § 2201 (Declaratory Judgment Act) because it includes claims for  
19 declaratory relief and infringement, including federally registered trademarks.

20 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the parties as they all reside or  
21 do business in this judicial district.


22 11. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)  
23 and (c), as DEFENDANTS reside in this judicial district, a substantial part of the  
24 events, omissions and acts which are the subject matter of this action occurred  
25 within the Central District of California.

#### 26 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

27 12. PLAINTIFF is a highly successful company which sells products  
28 relating to certain nicotine and vapor delivery system products.

1 13. PLAINTIFF is the owner of rights in the design mark FLUM in  
2 connection with electronic cigarette liquid (e-liquid) comprised of flavorings in  
3 liquid form, other than essential oils, used to refill electronic cigarette cartridges;  
4 electronic cigarette liquid (e-liquid) comprised of propylene glycol; electronic  
5 cigarette liquid (e-liquid) comprised of vegetable glycerin; electronic cigarettes;  
6 chemical flavorings in liquid form used to refill electronic cigarette cartridges;  
7 liquid nicotine solutions for use in electronic cigarettes sold in connection therewith  
8 (collectively, “Plaintiff’s Goods”), including United States Trademark Registration  
9 no. 6692431 filed on April 20, 2021, registered on April 5, 2022, with the first use  
10 in commerce date of at least as early as February 9, 2021 (referred to as the  
11 registered mark “FLUM”).

12 14. Specifically, PLAINTIFF’S design mark for FLUM is described as a  
13 stylized design comprised of the word, FLUM, against a solid rectangle with a small  
14 triangle cutout towards the upper right side.



22  
23 15. PLAINTIFF’S registered mark is described as “a stylized design  
24 comprised of the word, FLUM, against a solid rectangle with a small triangle cutout  
25 towards the upper right side.”

26 16. PLAINTIFF has continuously used FLUM in commerce in the United  
27 States in connection with Plaintiff’s Goods since at least as early as February 9,  
28

1 2021, and is currently using FLUM in United States commerce in connection with  
2 Plaintiff's Goods.

3 17. PLAINTIFF has devoted substantial time, effort, and resources to the  
4 development and extensive promotion of FLUM and the products offered  
5 thereunder. As a result of PLAINTIFF's efforts, the public has come to recognize  
6 and rely upon FLUM as an indication of the high quality associated with  
7 PLAINTIFF'S vaping-related products.

8 18. As a result of PLAINTIFF'S long-term and widespread use of FLUM  
9 in the United States via internet, print advertising, and continuous and unsolicited  
10 media coverage, FLUM enjoys a high degree of consumer recognition.

11 19. PLAINTIFF'S mark FLUM is inherently distinctive.

12 20. In or around early November 2021, PLAINTIFF discovered on the  
13 United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") website that DEFENDANT,  
14 on August 10, 2021, filed design trademark application no. 90875147, relating to  
15 electronic cigarette liquid (e-liquid) comprised of flavorings in liquid form, other  
16 than essential oils, used to refill electronic cigarette cartridges; electronic cigarette  
17 liquid (e-liquid) comprised of propylene glycol; electronic cigarette liquid (e-liquid)  
18 comprised of vegetable glycerin; electronic cigarettes; chemical flavorings in liquid  
19 form used to refill electronic cigarette cartridges; liquid nicotine solutions for use in  
20 electronic cigarettes (collectively, "Defendants' Infringing Products"), for the below  
21 mark:

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.