

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Fornix Holdings LLC, et al. v. Unknown Party

Fornix Holdings LLC v. Unknown Party, No. CV-25-01818-PHX-KML (D. Ariz. Apr. 6, 2026) · No. CV-25-01818-PHX-KML · Decided April 7, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona grants in part plaintiffs’ motion for default judgment in a copyright infringement action involving the website pleasurepixel.com. The court awards \$33,000 in statutory damages for infringement of 44 works, permanently enjoins further infringement, and orders measures concerning the domain name, including disabling and transfer-related actions. The court denies plaintiffs’ request for advance permission to conduct post-judgment discovery.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Krissa M. Lanham
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	April 7, 2026
DOCKET	CV-25-01818-PHX-KML
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for default judgment on a copyright-infringement claim against an unidentified defendant who allegedly operated a website distributing plaintiffs' copyrighted works.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the seven-factor Eitel framework governing whether to enter default judgment and evaluated the requested statutory damages and equitable relief under the Copyright Act and applicable equitable-relief standards.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- default judgment
- copyright infringement
- injunctions
- remedies
- discovery dispute

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Eitel factors supported entry of default judgment against the defendant.
2. Whether plaintiffs established copyright ownership and infringement sufficient to support default judgment.
3. What amount of statutory damages was appropriate for the 44 infringed works.
4. Whether plaintiffs were entitled to a permanent injunction against continued infringement.
5. Whether the court could order restrictions on and transfer of the allegedly infringing domain name.
6. Whether plaintiffs required advance court permission to conduct post-judgment discovery.

HOLDINGS

1. The Eitel factors, considered together, supported entry of default judgment despite the substantial amount sought and the federal policy favoring decisions on the merits.
2. Plaintiffs established a sufficiently strong claim for copyright infringement by showing copyright ownership and unauthorized copying, display, and distribution of protected works.
3. Plaintiffs were entitled to statutory damages of \$750 for each of the 44 infringed works, for a total award of \$33,000, rather than the requested \$30,000 per work.
4. Plaintiffs were entitled to a permanent injunction prohibiting the defendant and persons acting in concert with it from continuing to infringe plaintiffs' copyrighted works.
5. The court ordered Cloudflare, Inc. and VeriSign, Inc. to disable, lock, and prevent changes to pleasurepixel.com, and directed Cloudflare to transfer the domain name to plaintiffs' ownership and control.
6. Plaintiffs' request for advance permission to conduct post-judgment discovery was denied because such permission was not required for discovery concerning enforcement of the monetary judgment.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“These factors establish default judgment is appropriate.” (1)

“Without any meaningful evidence of the harm, an award of \$1.2 million would be an inappropriate windfall.” (2-3)

“The Clerk of Court is directed to enter a judgment in favor of plaintiffs and against John Doe as the owner and operator of pleasurepixel.com in the amount of \$33,000.00 and close this case.” (5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Fornix Holdings LLC owned copyrights in hundreds of works licensed to CP Productions, which operated a subscriber-based website. Plaintiffs alleged that the defendant owned and operated pleasurepixel.com and used it

to distribute unauthorized copies of 44 of plaintiffs' copyrighted videos. The defendant concealed its identity, failed to participate in the litigation, and allegedly communicated an intent to continue the infringing activities.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs alleged that John Doe, operating pleasurepixel.com, distributed unauthorized copies of their copyrighted audiovisual works. After the defendant failed to participate in the litigation, plaintiffs moved for default judgment, statutory damages, permanent injunctive relief, transfer of the domain name, and discovery to identify the defendant. The court granted the motion in part, entered judgment for \$33,000, issued permanent injunctive relief, ordered domain-name restrictions and transfer procedures, and denied the discovery request because post-judgment discovery did not require advance court permission.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Eitel v. McCool, 782 F.2d 1470, 1471-72 (9th Cir. 1986)
- PepsiCo, Inc. v. Cal. Sec. Cans, 238 F. Supp. 2d 1172, 1177 (C.D. Cal. 2002)
- Vietnam Reform Party v. Viet Tan - Vietnam Reform Party, 416 F. Supp. 3d 948, 962 (N.D. Cal. 2019)
- Ambrosetti v. Oregon Cath. Press, 151 F.4th 1211, 1218 (9th Cir. 2025)
- Landstar Ranger, Inc. v. Parth Enterprises, Inc., 725 F. Supp. 2d 916, 921 (C.D. Cal. 2010)
- Curtis v. Illumination Arts, Inc., 33 F. Supp. 3d 1200, 1212 (W.D. Wash. 2014)
- Shanghai Automation Instrument Co. v. Kuei, 194 F. Supp. 2d 995, 1005 (N.D. Cal. 2001)
- Blumenthal Distrib., Inc. v. Comoch Inc., 652 F. Supp. 3d 1117, 1131 (C.D. Cal. 2023)
- Peer Int'l Corp. v. Pausa Recs., Inc., 909 F.2d 1332, 1336 (9th Cir. 1990)
- Desire, LLC v. Manna Textiles, Inc., 986 F.3d 1253, 1271 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Atari Interactive, Inc. v. Redbubble, Inc., 546 F. Supp. 3d 883, 889 (N.D. Cal. 2021)
- eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C., 547 U.S. 388, 391, 393 (2006)
- Warner Bros. Ent. Inc. v. WTV Sys., Inc., 824 F. Supp. 2d 1003, 1012-13 (C.D. Cal. 2011)
- Herb Reed Enters., LLC v. Fla. Ent. Mgmt., Inc., 736 F.3d 1239, 1250 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd., 518 F. Supp. 2d 1197, 1217 (C.D. Cal. 2007)
- McGraw-Hill Glob. Educ. Holdings, LLC v. Khan, 323 F. Supp. 3d 488, 500-01 (S.D.N.Y. 2018)
- Philip Morris USA, Inc. v. Otamedia Ltd., 331 F. Supp. 2d 228, 246 (S.D.N.Y. 2004)
- Chevron Corp. v. Donziger, 325 F. Supp. 3d 371, 377 (S.D.N.Y. 2018)
- Data Axle, Inc. v. CFM Data Network, LLC, No. 23-CV-3255 (LMP/DLM), 2024 WL 5285003, at *1 (D. Minn. Dec. 9, 2024)