

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

CATHERINE ALEXANDER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 18-cv-966-SMY
)	
TAKE-TWO INTERACTIVE)	
SOFTWARE, INC. 2K GAMES, INC.,)	
2K SPORTS INC., WORLD WRESTLING)	
ENTERTAINMENT, INC., VISUAL)	
CONCEPTS ENTERTAINMENT,)	
YUKE'S CO., LTD, YUKES LA INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

YANDLE, District Judge:

Plaintiff Catherine Alexander filed this action against Defendants Take-Two Interactive Software, Inc., 2K Games, Inc., 2K Sports Inc., World Wrestling Entertainment, Inc., Visual Concepts Entertainment, Yuke’s Co., Ltd., and Yukes LA, Inc., asserting copyright infringement pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 501. The case is now before the Court for consideration of the Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendants 2K Games, 2K Sports, Take-Two, Visual Concepts, Yuke's, and Yuke's LA (Doc. 89) and the Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendant WWE (Doc. 92). Plaintiff filed a Response (Doc. 97). For the following reasons, Defendants’ Motion (Doc. 89) is **GRANTED in PART** and **DENIED in PART** and Defendant WWE’s Motion (Doc. 92) is **DENIED**.

Background

Plaintiff makes the following relevant allegations in the Complaint: Plaintiff, a professional tattoo artist, is a resident of the State of Illinois. Defendant Take-Two is a major developer,

publisher and marketer of interactive entertainment and video games. Defendant WWE is an entertainment company that creates and promotes various forms of entertainment media including video games. Defendants 2K Games and 2K Sports are publishers of video games, and Defendants Visual Concepts, Yuke's, and Yukes LA are developers of video games.

Plaintiff alleges that she owns a federal copyright for tattoos she inked on the body of WWE superstar Randy Orton between 2003 and 2008. She inked an upper back tribal tattoo on Orton in 2003, several tribal tattoos on Orton's forearms and upper arms in 2003, and sleeve tattoos on Orton's arms in 2008, consisting of a Bible verse design, dove, a rose, and skulls.

In 2009, Plaintiff contacted WWE about the reproduction of Orton's tattoos on various items for sale by the WWE. In response, WWE offered Plaintiff \$450 for extensive rights to use and reproduce the tattoo designs on WWE products. Plaintiff declined WWE's offer and told WWE that she did not grant any permission for them to reproduce her designs. Plaintiff submitted applications to register copyrights on each of the tattoos in March 2015.

Since October 2015, Defendants have released and promoted wrestling video games titled WWE 2K16, WWE 2K17 and WWE 2K18 (the "video games"), which have been available for sale throughout the United States. Orton is prominently featured in the videogames, including his tattoos. Plaintiff alleges that the videogames constitute willful copyright infringement because the games include clear, detailed and unauthorized reproductions of the tattoos she inked on Orton.

Discussion

Defendants Yuke's, Yuke's LA, and WWE Motions to Dismiss under 12(b)(2)

Defendants first argue that the Yuke's Defendants and WWE must be dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction. *F.R.C.P.*12(b)(2). Yuke's is a Japanese corporation and Yukes LA is a California corporation with its primary place of business in California. The Yuke's Defendants are not incorporated or headquartered in Illinois, nor do they have knowledge of sales or distribution of

WWE 2K video games to Illinois. WWE is a Delaware corporation with its principle place of business in Connecticut. WWE operates a website accessible throughout the United States that offers various WWE branded products for sale, including the WWE 2K video games.

A Complaint need not include facts alleging personal jurisdiction. But, once the defendant moves to dismiss the Complaint under this Rule 12(b)(2), the plaintiff must demonstrate that personal jurisdiction exists. *Purdue Research Found. v. Sanofi-Synthelabo, S.A.*, 338 F.3d 773, 782 (7th Cir. 2003). If the court rules on the motion without a hearing, the plaintiff need only establish a “*prima facie* case of personal jurisdiction.” *Id.* The court should read the entire Complaint liberally and draw every inference in the plaintiff’s favor. *Cent. States, Se. & Sw. Areas Pension Fund v. Phencorp Reins. Co.*, 440 F.3d 870, 878 (7th Cir. 2006). The court may also consider affidavits from both parties when determining whether a plaintiff has met its burden. *Felland v. Clifton*, 682 F.3d 665, 672 (7th Cir. 2012). While affidavits trump the pleadings in this context, all facts disputed in the affidavits will be resolved in the plaintiff’s favor. *Purdue Research Found.*, 338 F.3d at 782.

A federal court sitting in diversity looks to the personal-jurisdiction laws of the state in which the court sits to determine whether it has jurisdiction. *Hyatt*, 302 F.3d at 713 (citing *Dehmlow v. Austin Fireworks*, 963 F.2d 941, 945 (7th Cir. 1992)). Under Illinois law, the state long-arm statute permits personal jurisdiction over a party to the extent allowed under the due process provisions of the Illinois and United States constitutions. 735 ILCS 5/2-209(c); *Hyatt*, 302 F.3d at 714. There is no operative difference between Illinois and federal due process limits on the exercise of personal jurisdiction. *Hyatt* at 715.

Federal due process permits two categories of personal jurisdiction – general and specific. Specific jurisdiction arises out of a defendant’s suit-related contacts with a state and requires two conditions: (1) the defendant must purposefully direct his activities at the forum state; and (2) the defendant’s forum-related activities must be the cause of the plaintiff’s injury. *Tamburo v. Dworkin*,

601 F.3d 693, 702 (7th Cir. 2010) (citing *Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz*, 471 U.S. 462, 472 (1985)). With respect to intentional torts, the court must look to three factors: there must be “(1) intentional conduct (or ‘intentional and allegedly tortious’ conduct); (2) expressly aimed at the forum state; (3) with the defendant's knowledge that the effects would be felt—that is, the plaintiff would be injured—in the forum state.” *Id.* at 703; *see also Felland v. Clifton*, 682 F.3d 665, 674–75 (7th Cir. 2012) (reiterating the *Tamburo* standard). At the pleading stage, plaintiffs are not required to prove that the defendant has actually committed the tort in order to proceed with the case – allegations in the Complaint will suffice. *Id.* at 676.

In support of its Motion, WWE submitted an affidavit from Edward M. Kiang, WWE’s VP of Interactive Media Licensing (Doc. 92-1). According to Kiang, WWE does not distribute or sell the WWE 2K games through retail outlets. However, WWE does purchase limited quantities of the games at wholesale and offers them for sale through its website and has held 38 promotional events in Illinois featuring Orton between 2016 and 2018. Plaintiff asserts that personal jurisdiction as to WWE is proper in Illinois primarily because she contacted WWE in 2009 about its infringing activities. She argues her communications with WWE coupled with WWE holding live promotional events and selling the video games in question to residents in Illinois establish that WWE expressly directed its activities toward Illinois. The Court agrees.

Copyright infringement is an intentional tort. *See Bucklew v. Hawkins, Ash, Baptie & Co., LLP, and HAB, Inc.*, 329 F.3d 923, 931 (7th Cir. 2003). As to whether WWE expressly aimed its activities at Illinois, WWE concedes that it has promoted live shows in the state, including 38 live promotional events featuring Randy Orton in the past 3 years. Additionally, it directs television programming to Illinois and its website is accessible in the state. As such, the Court finds that WWE expressly aimed its activities at Illinois.

With respect to the third factor, while Kiang denies knowledge that Plaintiff lives in Illinois, Plaintiff alleges that someone at WWE knew or should have known she lives in Illinois and would therefore feel the effects of the copyright infringement in Illinois. Plaintiff's contacts with WWE occurred in 2009 – five years prior to Kiang becoming VP. At that time, Plaintiff informed WWE that she inked the tattoos on Orton and someone from WWE offered her \$450.00 for her work. Kiang's affidavit does not dispute these allegations. Whether he was aware of these alleged facts five years later is immaterial.

Drawing all inferences and factual disputes in Plaintiff's favor, the Court finds that Plaintiff has met her and that this Court has personal jurisdiction over WWE. Accordingly, WWE's Motion to Dismiss under *FRCP* 12(b)(2) (Doc. 92) is **DENIED**.

As to the Yuke's Defendants, Plaintiff contends that Yuke's has purposefully availed itself of the United States' market by developing, promoting, distributing, and marketing the infringing games. However, Plaintiff's allegations are insufficient to establish that these defendants have minimum contacts with Illinois, that they purposefully availed themselves of the benefits and protections of Illinois law, or that there is a real relationship between Illinois and the Yuke's Defendants. Nor has Plaintiff established that Yuke's, a Japanese corporation, has the necessary continuous and systematic general business contacts such that it is essentially "at home" in the United States for purposes of jurisdiction under *FRCP* 4(k)(2). *See Purdue Research Found*, 338 F.3d at 787 (These contacts must be so extensive to be tantamount to [a defendant] being constructively present in the state to such a degree that it would be fundamentally fair to require it to answer in a [forum] court in *any* litigation arising out of *any* transaction or occurrence taking place *anywhere* in the world). Accordingly, this Court does not have personal jurisdiction over the Yuke's Defendants and their Motion to Dismiss under *FRCP* 12(b)(2) (Doc. 89) is **GRANTED**.

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.