

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

GREAT NEW HAMPSHIRE RESTAURANTS, INC.,	Case No.
Plaintiff,	
v.	
DOORDASH, INC.,	
Defendant.	

COMPLAINT

The plaintiff Great New Hampshire Restaurants, LLC (“Plaintiff” or “GNHR”), by its undersigned attorneys Rath, Young, and Pignatelli P.C., for its complaint against the defendant Doordash, Inc. (“Doordash” or “Defendant”) alleges as follows:

NATURE OF CASE

1. This is an action of willful trademark infringement, unfair competition, injury to business reputation, and false and deceptive business practices, all in violation of the laws of the United States and the state of New Hampshire. Plaintiff seeks a permanent injunction, damages, including the profits of Doordash, trebled under the law, punitive damages, and related relief as more fully described herein.

THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff is a limited liability company operating under the laws of New Hampshire having its principal place of 12 Aspen Lane, Bedford, New Hampshire 03031.

3. Upon information and belief, Doordash is a California company with a principle place of business at 470 Olive Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under section 39 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1121, sections 1332(a), 1338(a) and 1338(b) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a) and § 1338(b). This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the non-federal claims asserted herein pursuant to section 1367 of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), which provides supplemental jurisdiction.

5. Personal jurisdiction over Doordash is proper because Doordash is conducting business in this judicial district and committing torts in this state, including without limitation Doordash's trademark infringement, unfair competition, and deceptive trade practices, which cause harm in this state and in this judicial district.

6. Venue properly lies in the judicial district under sections 1391(b) and (c) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (d), because a substantial portion of the events at issue have arisen and/or will arise in this judicial district and because this Court has personal jurisdiction over Doordash. In a trademark infringement lawsuit, a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurs in any district in which consumers are likely to be confused by the infringing goods or services, whether that occurs in one district or many districts.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

A. Plaintiff's Business and Trademarks

7. GNHR operates a number of popular restaurants in New Hampshire under the following trademarks: COPPER DOOR®, CHEF NICOLE'S® (the "Registered GNHR Marks"), CJ'S™, T-BONEST™, and CACTUS JACK'S™ (the "Unregistered GNHR Marks" and

together with the Registered GNHR Marks, collectively, the “GNHR Marks”).

8. GNHR has been using the GNHR Marks continuously for many years in connection with restaurant services and has invested considerable time, money and other resources in connection with the sale and advertising of its restaurant services in connection with the GNHR Marks.

9. The GNHR Marks each serve as unique signifiers of the quality, reputation and goodwill of GNHR in the marketplace.

10. Plaintiff uses its GNHR Marks by displaying them on menus, signage, promotional materials, advertising materials, and websites.

11. Over the years, Plaintiff has invested millions of dollars in the promotion and advertising of goods and services sold under the GNHR Marks in New Hampshire and its surrounding states to create a strong association between Plaintiff’s products and services, its goodwill among consumers and the GNHR Marks.

12. The care and skill exercised by Plaintiff in conducting its business has resulted in the high quality of the products and services offered under its GNHR Marks.

13. As a result of the extensive advertising, sale and promotion of Plaintiff’s products and services, its GNHR Marks have acquired secondary meaning throughout the area whereby the GNHR Marks are widely recognized by the general consuming public in New Hampshire and its surrounding states as signifying Plaintiff as the unique source of the goods and services sold in connection with the GNHR Marks.

14. The GNHR Marks are strong and warrant broad protection in both related and unrelated product and/or service classes.

B. Doordash's Infringing Conduct

15. Upon information and belief, Doordash is a food delivery business that promises its customers speedy delivery from different restaurants located throughout New Hampshire and surrounding states, including GNHR restaurants.

16. GNHR is in no way affiliated with Doordash but, upon information and belief, Doordash causes customers to falsely believe that Doordash has a relationship with GNHR because the GNHR menus and the GNHR Marks appear on Doordash's website and app.

17. In addition, Doordash represents on its website its states "Be a Partner Restaurant," thus implying that every restaurant listed on its website, GNHR included, is a "partner restaurant."

18. Upon information and belief, GNHR customers see GNHR marks and menus at the Doordash website or app and then provide a debit or credit card to Doordash for payment of GNHR goods and services.

19. Upon information and belief, customers pay Doordash directly for GNHR's products and services whereupon Doordash then orders the same products and services from GNHR and pays GNHR when it picks up the food for delivery to customers. However, upon information and belief, the GNHR menus used by Doordash do not always match the menus currently in use at GNHR.

20. Upon information and belief, Doordash does not notify GNHR when delivery drivers employed by Doordash order food from GNHR restaurants. They do not to use the name "Doordash" when picking up orders from GNHR.

21. Upon information and belief, Doordash's use of the GNHR Marks has and is

likely to continue to confuse and mislead consumers into believing that Doordash's services are sponsored by, licensed from or otherwise affiliated with GNHR and Doordash's products and services adhere to the high standards expected from GNHR.

22. Upon information and belief, Doordash's products and services do not adhere to the high standards expected from GNHR, putting GNHR at risk for claims by customers relating to the quality of its food products.

23. GNHR cannot control how Doordash cares for its food products during the delivery process by Doordash. It has no control over the time Doordash spends to make a delivery nor whether Doordash regularly complies with the applicable health and sanitary codes.

24. Doordash places GNHR at risk for customer complaints, which would substantially damage GNHR's business reputation, and would result in irreparable damages and financial loss.

25. Indeed, as a result of Doordash's use of the certain GNHR Marks, the T-BONES® and CJ'S® marks most recently, GNHR has received a number of customer complaints regarding Doordash's services under the mistaken belief the GNHR is responsible for the poor service provided by Doordash.

26. Accordingly, GNHR has on more than one occasion asked Doordash to remove GNHR restaurants from Doordash's website and app.

27. While representatives at Doordash represented that Doordash would cease advertising on its website that it delivered from GNHR restaurants, the problem has been recurring.

28. Upon information and belief, Doordash's use of the GNHR Marks is intentionally and willfully meant to confuse and mislead consumers as to Doordash's affiliation with GNHR

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.