

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Aylo Premium Ltd. v. John Does 1–20, et al.

Aylo Premium · No. 3:25-cv-05473-BHS · Decided December 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington grants Aylo Premium Ltd.’s motion for default judgment against Alex Abdullaev in a copyright infringement action. The court awards \$10,200,000 in statutory damages, grants permanent injunctive relief including disabling and transferring specified domain names, and awards \$20,680 in attorneys’ fees and \$755 in costs. The Clerk is directed to enter judgment and close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Benjamin H. Settle
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	December 18, 2025
DOCKET	3:25-cv-05473-BHS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for default judgment against defendant Alex Abdullaev in a copyright infringement action after Abdullaev failed to answer.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court exercised discretion in determining statutory damages within the ranges prescribed by 17 U.S.C. § 504(c), and equitable discretion in determining whether to issue a permanent injunction under the four-factor test of eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

TOPICS

- copyright infringement
- default judgment
- injunctions
- damages
- attorney fees

PRACTICE AREAS

- copyright
- civil procedure
- remedies
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Aylo was entitled to statutory damages for Abdullaev's willful infringement and, if so, in what amount.
2. Whether Aylo was entitled to a permanent injunction against further infringement.
3. Whether the court should order the relevant domain registries to disable and transfer the websites' domain names to Aylo.
4. Whether Aylo was entitled to attorney's fees and costs under 17 U.S.C. § 505.

HOLDINGS

1. Aylo was entitled to statutory damages, but the court declined to award the requested \$30.6 million and instead awarded \$5,000 for each of 2,040 infringed works, totaling \$10,200,000.
2. Aylo was entitled to a permanent injunction precluding Abdullaev from infringing Aylo's copyrighted works.
3. The court ordered the registries hosting Abdullaev's websites to disable and transfer the specified domain names to Aylo.
4. Aylo was entitled to \$20,680 in attorney's fees and \$755 in costs under 17 U.S.C. § 505.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Aylo has demonstrated Abdullaev willfully infringed its copyrighted works and a statutory damages award is warranted and required.” (at 2)

“In short, Aylo is entitled to a permanent injunction precluding Abdullaev from infringing on its copyrighted works.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Aylo alleged that Abdullaev owned and operated websites that pirated its copyrighted adult-entertainment videos. The court found that Abdullaev willfully infringed 2,040 copyrighted works displayed at approximately 71,400 URLs. Aylo asserted substantial but difficult-to-calculate revenue losses and sought \$15,000 per work, while the court found that only a fraction of the websites' visitors would have paid for Aylo's services.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Aylo Premium sued Abdullaev and John Does 1–20, alleging that Abdullaev operated websites displaying pirated copies of Aylo's copyrighted adult-entertainment videos. Abdullaev did not answer, and Aylo moved for default judgment. The court granted default judgment, awarded statutory damages, entered permanent injunctive relief, ordered domain registries to disable and transfer specified domain names, awarded attorney's fees and costs, and directed the Clerk to enter judgment and close the case.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Harris v. Emus Records Corp., 734 F.2d 1329, 1335 (9th Cir. 1984)
- F.W. Woolworth Co. v. Contemporary Arts, Inc., 344 U.S. 228, 232 (1952)
- Jackson v. Sturkie, 255 F. Supp. 2d 1096, 1101 (N.D. Cal. 2003)
- L.A. News Service v. Reuters Television International, Ltd., 149 F.3d 987, 996 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Getty Images (U.S.), Inc. v. Virtual Clinics, No. C13-0626 JLR, 2014 WL 1116775 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 20, 2014)
- eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C., 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006)
- Apple Computer, Inc. v. Franklin Computer Corp., 714 F.2d 1240, 1255 (3d Cir. 1983)
- Will Co. Ltd. v. Lee, No. 3:20-cv-05802-BHS (W.D. Wash. 2025)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA 7 AYLO PREMIUM LTD, a limited CASE NO. 25-CV-5473-BHS 8 liability
company organized under the laws of the Republic of Cyprus, ORDER 9 Plaintiff, 10 v. 11 JOHN
DOES 1–20, et al., 12 Defendants. 13 THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff Aylo
Premium Ltd’s motion for 14 default judgment against defendant Alex Abdullaev.

Dkt. 20. 15 Aylo asserts copyright infringement claims against Abdullaev and John Does 1– 16 20.
Dkt. 10. It claims Abdullaev owns and operates several websites that pirate Aylo’s 17 copyrighted
adult entertainment videos. Id. Abdullaev did not answer. Dkt. 17. 18 Aylo now moves for default
judgment against Abdullaev. Dkt. 20. It alleges 19 Abdulleev displayed 2,040 of its copyrighted
works at 71,400 URLs, and “seeks only 20 \$15,000 in statutory damages per work infringed.” Id.
at 5.

It argues Abdullaev’s conduct 21 was willful, and asks the Court to award \$30,600,000 in total to
“deter would-be 22 1 infringers.” Id. at 11–12. Aylo estimates it has lost over \$172 million per
month in 2 revenue, though it admits it is “impossible to calculate the exact loss resulting from
[this] 3 piracy operation” because not all 17 million monthly visitors to Abdullaev’s websites 4
would have subscribed to Aylo’s paid services.” Id. at 8.

5 “In a case where the copyright owner sustains the burden of proving, and the court 6 finds, that
infringement was committed willfully, the court in its discretion may increase 7 the award of
statutory damages to a sum of not more than \$150,000.” 17 U.S.C. § 8 504(c)(2).

The Court has wide discretion in determining the amount of statutory damages 9 to be awarded
within the ranges provided by 17 U.S.C. § 504(c)(1)–(2). Harris v. Emus 10 Records Corp., 734
F.2d 1329, 1335 (9th Cir. 1984). It must do what is just in the 11 particular case, “considering the
nature of the copyright, the circumstances of the 12 infringement and the like... but with the

express qualification that in every case the 13 assessment must be within the prescribed [statutory range].

Within these limitations the 14 court's discretion and sense of justice are controlling." F.W. Woolworth Co. v. Contemp. 15 Arts, Inc., 344 U.S. 228, 232 (1952) (emphasis added). "Statutory damages are 16 particularly appropriate in a case... in which [a] defendant has failed to mount any 17 defense or to participate in discovery." Jackson v. Sturkie, 255 F. Supp. 2d 1096, 1101 18 (N.D.

Cal. 2003). Further, "[b]ecause awards of statutory damages serve both 19 compensatory and punitive purposes, a plaintiff may recover statutory damages 'whether 20 or not there is adequate evidence of the actual damages suffered by plaintiff or of the 21 profits reaped by defendant.'" L.A. News Serv. v. Reuters Television Int'l., Ltd., 149 F.3d 22 987, 996 (9th Cir.

1998) (quoting Harris, 734 F.2d at 1335); see also Getty Images 1 (U.S.), Inc. v. Virtual Clinics, No C13-0626 JLR, 2014 WL 1116775 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 2 20, 2014). 3 Aylo has demonstrated Abdullaev willfully infringed its copyrighted works and a 4 statutory damages award is warranted and required.

However, the Court in its discretion 5 declines to award Aylo the \$30.6 million it requests. Aylo concedes its exact revenue loss 6 is "impossible to calculate." Dkt. 20 at 8. The Court finds that only a fraction of the 7 visitors would have paid for Aylo's services.

In its discretion and in the interests of 8 justice, the Court will award \$5,000 for each of the 2,040 offending works, totaling 9 \$10,200,000. 10 Aylo also seeks permanent injunctive relief under 17 U.S.C. § 502(a). Id. at 13. 11 The Court may grant a permanent injunction where the plaintiff demonstrates that (1) "it 12 has suffered an irreparable injury;" (2) "remedies available at law, such as monetary 13 damages, are inadequate to compensate for that injury;" (3) "considering the balance of 14 hardships between the plaintiff and defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted;" and (4) 15 "the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction." eBay Inc. v. 16 MercExchange, L.L.C., 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006).

The Court does so in the exercise of its 17 equitable discretion. Id. 18 Aylo has demonstrated each of the elements required for a permanent injunction. 19 It has demonstrated that the copyrighted videos hosted on Abdullaev's websites have a 20 significant viewer base, resulting in Aylo losing market share. Dkt. 20 at 8. It is also 21 apparent monetary damages will not be adequate to prevent future infringement because 22 Aylo may not be able to collect the default judgment from Abdullaev.

Id. at 14. The 1 balance of hardships in the absence of injunctive relief tilts towards Aylo, and public 2 interest is served by granting injunctive relief. See Apple Comput., Inc. v. Franklin 3 Comput. Corp., 714 F.2d 1240, 1255 (3d Cir. 1983) ("[I]t is virtually axiomatic that the 4 public interest can only be served by upholding copyright protections and, 5 correspondingly, preventing

the misappropriation of the skills, creative energies, and 6 resources which are invested in the protected work.”).

In short, Aylo is entitled to a 7 permanent injunction precluding Abdullaev from infringing on its copyrighted works. 8 Next, Aylo requests the Court to order the registries that host Abdullaev’s 9 websites to disable and transfer the domains to Aylo. Dkt. 20 at 16–18 (citing, inter alia, 10 Will Co. Ltd. v. Lee, No. 3:20-cv-05802-BHS (W.D. Wash. 2025)).

The Court agrees and 11 ORDERS the registries to DISABLE and TRANSFER the domain names to Aylo as 12 indicated in Aylo’s motion, Dkt. 20 at 16–18. 13 Finally, Aylo Premium seeks \$20,680 in attorneys’ fees and \$755 in costs. Id. at 14 18. These fees and costs appear reasonable in light of the stakes and the effort reflected in 15 the record, and the Court ORDERS such an award of fees and costs under 17 U.S.C. § 16 505.

17 The Clerk shall enter a JUDGMENT consistent with this Order and close the 18 case. 19 Dated this 18th day of December, 2025. A 20 21 BBEENNJAAMMIINN HH.. SSEETTTTLLEE 22 UUnniitteedd SSttaatteess DDiissttrricctt JJuuddggee