

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Strata Skin Sciences, Inc. v. Laseroptek America Corp., et al.

Strata Skin Sciences, Inc. v. Laseroptek America Corp., No. 24-4138 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 21, 2026) · No. No. 24-4138
· Decided January 21, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania denied most aspects of Defendants’ motion to dismiss Strata Skin Sciences’ second amended complaint alleging Lanham Act false advertising, Pennsylvania common-law unfair competition, and civil conspiracy. The court held that it had specific personal jurisdiction over LaserOptek Co. Ltd. and C. Dalton International LLC and that the complaint plausibly stated false-advertising and unfair-competition claims concerning representations that Pallas laser treatments were reimbursable under specified CPT codes. The court dismissed or declined to sustain the civil-conspiracy claim while allowing the principal claims against the individual defendants to proceed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gerald Austin McHugh
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	January 21, 2026
DOCKET	No. 24-4138
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2) and 12(b)(6) to dismiss Strata's second amended complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	On a Rule 12(b)(2) motion without an evidentiary hearing, the plaintiff need only establish a prima facie case of personal jurisdiction, with allegations taken as true and factual disputes drawn in the plaintiff's favor. Under Rule 12(b)(6), the court applied the standard requiring a complaint to state a plausible claim for relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum; precedential status unknown

TOPICS

motions to dismiss

personal jurisdiction

trademark law

commercial litigation

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

intellectual property

commercial litigation

civil procedure

health law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court could exercise specific personal jurisdiction over Laseroptek Co. Ltd. and C. Dalton International LLC.
2. Whether the second amended complaint plausibly stated a Lanham Act false-advertising claim based on representations concerning CPT-code reimbursement.
3. Whether the complaint plausibly stated Pennsylvania common-law unfair-competition claims.
4. Whether the complaint sufficiently attributed allegedly false statements to each defendant rather than relying impermissibly on group pleading.
5. Whether the complaint stated a civil-conspiracy claim under Pennsylvania law where the alleged purpose of the conduct was to market and sell defendants' products and gain a market advantage.

HOLDINGS

1. The complaint sufficiently alleged specific personal jurisdiction over Laseroptek Co. Ltd. because its agreement with a Pennsylvania-based independent sales representative and the representative's alleged Pennsylvania activities plausibly established purposeful direction, a nexus to the claims, and fairness.
2. The complaint sufficiently alleged specific personal jurisdiction over C. Dalton International LLC.
3. The second amended complaint plausibly stated a false-advertising claim under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act based on allegations that defendants falsely represented Pallas-laser psoriasis treatments as reimbursable under the CPT Codes.
4. The second amended complaint plausibly stated a Pennsylvania common-law unfair-competition claim based on the alleged false advertising.
5. The second amended complaint sufficiently alleged false advertising by each defendant and did not require dismissal for impermissible group pleading.
6. The civil-conspiracy claim failed because Pennsylvania law requires malicious intent to be the sole purpose of the conspiracy, while Strata alleged that defendants acted to market and sell Pallas lasers and gain a market advantage.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Contractual disclaimers of agency are not dispositive.” (III.1. Laseroptek Korea)

“Strata cannot have it both ways.” (III. Plaintiff does not state a claim for civil conspiracy)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Strata, a Pennsylvania-based marketer of excimer laser medical devices, alleged that defendants marketed competing Pallas solid-state lasers for dermatological treatments. Strata claimed defendants represented to physicians and prospective customers that psoriasis treatments performed with Pallas lasers were reimbursable under CPT Codes 96920, 96921, and 96922, despite the alleged limitation of those codes to excimer laser treatment. Strata also alleged that defendants made comparative promotional statements portraying the Pallas lasers as technologically, functionally, and clinically equivalent or superior to Strata's excimer lasers.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Strata filed an action alleging Lanham Act false advertising, Pennsylvania common-law unfair competition, and civil conspiracy based on statements concerning reimbursement of psoriasis treatments performed with defendants' Pallas lasers and comparisons between the Pallas and Strata's excimer lasers. After the court granted leave to amend, Strata filed a second amended complaint. The court denied the motion to dismiss except as to the civil-conspiracy count, which it dismissed with prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Miller Yacht Sales, Inc. v. Smith, 384 F.3d 93, 97 (3d Cir. 2004)
- Fowler v. UPMC Shadyside, 578 F.3d 203, 210 (3d Cir. 2009)
- N. Penn Gas Co. v. Corning Nat. Gas Corp., 897 F.2d 687, 689, 691 (3d Cir. 1990)
- International Shoe Co. v. State of Washington, International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945)
- O'Connor v. Sandy Lane Hotel Co., 496 F.3d 312, 317, 325 (3d Cir. 2007)
- Daimler AG v. Bauman, 571 U.S. 117, 135 n.13 (2014)
- First Liberty Inv. Grp. v. Nicholsberg, 145 F.3d 647, 652 (3d Cir. 1998)
- Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz, 471 U.S. 462, 476–77 (1985)
- McGee v. International Life Insurance Co., 355 U.S. 220, 223 (1957)
- World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286, 294 (1980)
- Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Superior Court, 582 U.S. 255, 268 (2017)
- IMO Indus., Inc. v. Kiekert AG, 155 F.3d 254, 265 (3d Cir. 1998)
- Numeric Analytics, LLC v. McCabe, 161 F. Supp. 3d 348, 357 n.3 (E.D. Pa. 2016)
- Westbrook Monster Mix Co. v. Easy Gardener Prods., Inc., No. 23-2952, 2024 WL 816243, at *5 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 27, 2024)
- Lexmark Int'l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc., 572 U.S. 118, 122 (2014)
- Ditri v. Coldwell Banker Residential Affiliates, Inc., 954 F.2d 869, 872 (3d Cir. 1992)
- N. Am. Med. Corp. v. Axiom Worldwide Inc., 522 F.3d 1211, 1226 (11th Cir. 2008)

- Carpenter Tech. Corp. v. Allegheny Techs., Inc., No. 08-2907, 2011 WL 3652447, at *4 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 18, 2011)
- U.S. Healthcare, Inc. v. Blue Cross of Greater Phila., 898 F.2d 914, 922 (3d Cir. 1990)
- Church & Dwight Co. v. SPD Swiss Precision Diagnostics, 843 F.3d 48, 70–71 (2d Cir. 2016)
- KDH Elec. Sys. v. Curtis Tech. Ltd., 826 F. Supp. 2d 782, 807 (E.D. Pa. 2011)
- Pa. State Univ. v. Univ. Orthopedics, Ltd., 706 A.2d 863, 870–71 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1998)
- GOLO, LLC v. HighYa, LLC, 310 F. Supp. 3d 499, 504 (E.D. Pa. 2018)
- Farah v. Esquire Mag., 736 F.3d 528, 541 (D.C. Cir. 2013)
- Facenda v. N.F.L. Films, Inc., 542 F.3d 1007, 1017 (3d Cir. 2008)
- Bolger v. Youngs Drug Prods. Corp., 463 U.S. 60, 64 (1983)
- Refundo, LLC v. Drake Enters., Ltd., No. 13-643, 2013 WL 1750016, at *13 (D.N.J. Apr. 22, 2013)
- Sarpolis v. Tereshko, 26 F. Supp. 3d 407, 423 (E.D. Pa. 2014), *aff'd*, 625 F. App'x 594 (3d Cir. 2016)
- NRA Grp., LLC v. Durenleau, 154 F.4th 153, 172 (3d Cir. 2025)
- Thompson Coal Co. v. Pike Coal Co., 412 A.2d 466, 472 (Pa. 1979)
- Commonwealth v. TAP Pharm. Prods., 36 A.3d 1112, 1184–85 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2011)