

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Haynes North America, Inc. and Haynes Group Limited v.
eManualOnline.com

No. 2:24-cv-09359-CBM-MAA (C.D. Cal. May 23, 2025) · No. 2:24-cv-09359-CBM-MAA · Decided May 23,
2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California denied Plaintiffs’ renewed motion for a preliminary injunction in a copyright and trademark infringement action for lack of personal jurisdiction over Defendant. The Court found that Plaintiffs had not shown Defendant purposefully directed its activities toward California under the Calder effects test. The Court nevertheless granted limited expedited discovery concerning personal jurisdiction and damages, to be completed by August 1, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Consuelo B. Marshall
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	May 23, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-09359-CBM-MAA
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs renewed their motion for a preliminary injunction after the Court denied a temporary restraining order and plaintiffs completed alternative service of the complaint and motion. Plaintiffs also requested expedited discovery concerning personal jurisdiction and damages.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A preliminary injunction requires consideration of likelihood of success on the merits, likelihood of irreparable harm, the balance of equities, and the public interest. Alternatively, under the Ninth Circuit's serious-questions test, a preliminary injunction may issue upon serious questions going to the merits, a likelihood of irreparable injury, a balance of hardships tipping sharply toward the plaintiff, and consistency with the public interest. The Court also applied the Ninth

Circuit's three-part specific-personal-jurisdiction test and reviewed the request for expedited discovery under the good-cause standard.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE

Unknown; unpublished district-court order

TOPICS

personal jurisdiction

injunctions

discovery dispute

copyright infringement

trademark infringement

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

intellectual property

copyright

trademark

commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs established specific personal jurisdiction over the nonresident defendant based on online sales and alleged infringement directed toward California.
2. Whether plaintiffs were entitled to a preliminary injunction.
3. Whether plaintiffs demonstrated good cause for expedited discovery concerning personal jurisdiction and damages.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs failed to establish that defendant purposefully directed its activities toward California under the Calder effects test, and therefore failed to establish specific personal jurisdiction.
2. The Court denied the preliminary-injunction motion because plaintiffs had not established personal jurisdiction over defendant.
3. Plaintiffs demonstrated good cause for expedited discovery concerning personal jurisdiction and damages, so the Court granted the request.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Express aiming requires more than the defendant’s awareness that the plaintiff it is alleged to have harmed resides in or has strong ties to the forum, because the plaintiff cannot be the only link between the defendant and the forum.” (Section III.A)

“In other words, a plaintiff must show that the forum state was “the focal point both of the [conduct] and of the harm suffered.”” (Section III.A)

“The Court agrees—given the challenges Plaintiffs have faced to date in locating and serving Defendant, the Court finds that expedited discovery regarding personal jurisdiction over Defendant and damages stemming from Defendant’s sales of manuals infringing on Plaintiffs’ works is appropriate.” (Section III.C)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Haynes sells repair and maintenance manuals for automotive and powersports equipment. Plaintiffs alleged that eManualOnline.com sold electronic files, including whole or partial scans of Haynes manuals, that infringed

plaintiffs' copyrights and trademarks. A California-based investigator purchased six manuals from defendant's website, but the record did not show that defendant specifically targeted California, knew plaintiffs were located there, or knew the investigator was a California resident.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed this copyright and trademark infringement action on October 29, 2024. The Court previously denied plaintiffs' request for a temporary restraining order, granted alternative service, and required proof of service. Defendant was served but did not appear or respond. The Court denied the preliminary-injunction motion for lack of personal jurisdiction but granted limited expedited discovery.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand. Expedited discovery was limited to personal jurisdiction over defendant and damages stemming from defendant's sales of manuals allegedly infringing plaintiffs' works, and was ordered completed by August 1, 2025. If discovery established jurisdiction, plaintiffs could seek entry of default judgment after first applying for entry of default under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(a).

CASES CITED

- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Flathead-Lolo-Bitterroot Citizen Task Force v. Montana, 98 F.4th 1180, 1190 (9th Cir. 2024)
- All. for the Wild Rockies v. Pena, 865 F.3d 1211, 1217 (9th Cir. 2017)
- All. for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1133 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Pebble Beach Co. v. Caddy, 453 F.3d 1151, 1154-55 (9th Cir. 2006)
- Licea v. Caraway Home Inc., 655 F. Supp. 3d 954, 961 (C.D. Cal. 2023)
- Ayla, LLC v. Alya Skin Pty. Ltd., 11 F.4th 972, 979-80 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Daimler AG v. Bauman, 571 U.S. 117, 139 (2014)
- Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co., 374 F.3d 797, 802 (9th Cir. 2004)
- AMA Multimedia, LLC v. Wanat, 970 F.3d 1201, 1208-09 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Calder v. Jones, 465 U.S. 783 (1984)
- Mavrix Photo, Inc. v. Brand Technologies, Inc., 647 F.3d 1218, 1229 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Walden v. Fiore, Walden v. Fiore, 571 U.S. 277, 285-86 (2014)
- Lanard Toys Ltd. v. Toys 2 Discover Inc., 2022 WL 2155976, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 11, 2022)
- Handsome Music, LLC v. Etoro USA LLC, 2020 WL 8455111, at *10 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 17, 2020)
- P & P Imports LLC v. OJCommerce, LLC, 2019 WL 8012690, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 4, 2019)
- Tart Optical Enterprises, LLC v. Light Co., 2019 WL 9048862, at *13 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2019)

- Matus v. Premium Nutraceuticals, LLC, 2016 WL 3078745, at *3 (C.D. Cal. May 31, 2016), aff'd, 715 F. App'x 662 (9th Cir. 2018)
- Axiom Foods, Inc. v. Acerchem International, Inc., 874 F.3d 1064, 1071 (9th Cir. 2017)
- Graco Minnesota Inc. v. PF Brands, Inc., 2019 WL 1746580, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2019)
- Joe Leighton & Assocs., Inc. v. Log Lighter Sales, Inc., 2008 WL 11406052, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2008)
- Advice Co. v. Novak, 2009 WL 210503, at *16 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2009)
- MGA Entertainment, Inc. v. Innovation First, Inc., 2010 WL 11601032, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 14, 2010)
- Boschetto v. Hansing, 539 F.3d 1011, 1020 (9th Cir. 2008)
- Hard Drive Productions, Inc. v. Does 1-130, 2011 WL 5573960, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2011)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-cal/2025/haynes-north-america-inc-and-haynes-group-limited-v-dvw88mdg>