

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW
YORK

**Eli Zhadanov and Interlink Products International, Inc. v. Xiamen
Huangyudu Cosmetics Co., Ltd. and Huian County Mubing E-
Commerce Co., Ltd.**

Zhadanov · No. 26-CV-1027(EK)(PCG) · Decided February 23, 2026

SUMMARY

The Eastern District of New York denied plaintiffs’ ex parte request for a temporary restraining order in a patent and related commercial dispute involving showerhead products sold on Amazon. The court held that plaintiffs had not certified efforts to provide notice or reasons why notice should be excused and had not separately moved for the requested relief. The court also ordered plaintiffs to show cause why the action should not be transferred to the Western District of Washington to avoid duplicative litigation.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK -----
-----x ELI ZHADANOV and INTERLINK PRODUCTS INTERNATIONAL, INC,
MEMORANDUM & ORDER Plaintiffs, 26-CV-1027(EK)(PCG) -against- XIAMEN
HUANGYUDU COSMETICS CO., LTD. and HUIAN COUNTY MUBING E-COMMERCE
CO., LTD., Defendants. -----x ERIC KOMITEE, United States District
Judge: Plaintiffs are a company that develops and sells shower and bath products and the
company’s president; they sue two Chinese companies that sell showerheads on Amazon that
allegedly infringe the plaintiffs’ patents.

Compl. ¶¶ 2-3, 9- 15, 22-30. Plaintiff Interlink complained to Amazon of the possible
infringement and submitted a complaint through the Amazon Patent Evaluation Express program
in December 2025; defendants rejected the offer to participate and instead filed declaratory-
judgment actions against Interlink that remain pending in the Western District of Washington.

Id. ¶¶ 35-37. Plaintiffs have also requested a temporary restraining order (“TRO”), directing the
defendants to refrain from (1) making false or misleading statements regarding the specific
showerheads at issue; (2) selling any products under Amazon Standard Identification Numbers
where the defendants made allegedly false or misleading statements related to the specific
showerheads at issue; and (3) distributing in commerce any units of products containing any
misleading or inaccurate statements about the flow rate or legal compliance of the products.

Id. at 25. The TRO request is ex parte: plaintiffs have provided no written or oral notice to the defendants or their attorneys. For the reasons set forth below, this request is denied. When a movant seeks an ex parte TRO, it must, among other things, certify in writing “any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required.” Fed. R. Civ.

P. 65(b)(1)(B); FEI Hong Kong Co. v. GlobalFoundries, Inc., No. 20-CV-2342, 2020 WL 1444956, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 25, 2020) (denying TRO as plaintiff had “not provided any reasons why notice was unnecessary or impractical”); Gullas v. 37-31 73rd St. Owners Corp., No. 12-CV-2301, 2012 WL 1655520, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. May 10, 2012) (denying TRO as plaintiffs had “neither shown that Defendant was given notice of this motion nor made any showing as to why notice should not be required”).

This failure alone renders ex parte relief inappropriate. E.g., Pro. Merch. Advance Cap., LLC v. C Care Servs., LLC, No. 13-CV-6562, 2013 WL 12109397, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 2, 2013) (“Plaintiff’s attorney has not submitted anything about efforts to give notice or reasons why notice should not be required. That omission alone is fatal to the application....”).

Plaintiffs have also not separately moved for this preliminary relief; the request for a TRO appears only in the complaint. It is thus not properly before this Court. Allens Creek / Corbetts Glen Pres. Grp., Inc. v. Caldera, 88 F. Supp. 2d 77, 83 (W.D.N.Y. 2000), aff’d sub nom. Allens Creek / Corbetts Glen Pres. Grp., Inc. v. West, 2 F. App’x 162 (2d Cir. 2001) (collecting cases and explaining that “[i]f a party seeks immediate relief, Rule 65... requires the filing of a motion”).

For the reasons set forth above, the request for a TRO is denied. If plaintiffs wishes to pursue a preliminary injunction, they should file a motion in compliance with Rule 65 and serve that motion on the defendants.

In light of the plaintiffs’ representations regarding the pending action in the Western District of Washington, plaintiffs are further ordered to show cause no later than March 2, 2026, why this action should not be transferred to the Western District of Washington, to avoid duplicative litigation. SO ORDERED. /s/ Eric Komitee ERIC KOMITEE United States District Judge Dated: February 23, 2026 Brooklyn, New York