

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA

**Bridlington Bud Ltd. v. The Partnerships, Unincorporated
Associations Identified on Schedule A**

No. 1:25-24124-CIV-MARTINEZ (S.D. Fla. Dec. 9, 2025) (Report and Recommendation) · No. 1:25-24124-CIV-MARTINEZ · Decided December 9, 2025

SUMMARY

This Report and Recommendation addresses Bridlington Bud Ltd.’s motion for a preliminary injunction against five online sellers alleged to have infringed and counterfeited its GJX trademark on Walmart.com. The magistrate judge recommends granting injunctive relief, including restrictions on infringing activity, an asset freeze, restraints directed to third-party payment and marketplace providers, and continuation of a \$5,000 bond. The recommendation was issued on December 9, 2025, with objections due by December 12, 2025.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Eduardo I. Sanchez
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida
DECIDED	December 9, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-24124-CIV-MARTINEZ
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a preliminary injunction, including an asset restraint, against five online sellers accused of trademark infringement and counterfeiting. The magistrate judge issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the motion be granted.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A preliminary injunction requires a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, a likelihood of irreparable injury absent relief, a balance of threatened harms favoring the movant, and consistency with the public interest. Objections to the Report and Recommendation are subject to de novo review by the district judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); unobjected-to issues are reviewed on appeal only for plain error if necessary in the interests of justice.

PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Bridlington Bud Ltd. v. The Partnerships, Unincorporated Associations Identified on Schedule A

TOPICS

trademark infringement injunctions asset protection equitable relief civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

trademark infringement intellectual property commercial litigation civil procedure equitable remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff established the requirements for a preliminary injunction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65.
2. Whether the evidence established a substantial likelihood of success on plaintiff's trademark-infringement and false-designation claims.
3. Whether plaintiff showed likely irreparable injury, favorable balancing of harms, and that an injunction would serve the public interest.
4. Whether the court could preliminarily restrain defendants' assets and related third-party accounts to preserve the availability of equitable relief.
5. What scope of injunctive relief, notice procedures, and bond were appropriate.

HOLDINGS

1. A party seeking a preliminary injunction must establish a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, likely irreparable injury absent relief, that the threatened injury outweighs the harm to the nonmovant, and that the injunction serves the public interest.
2. Plaintiff demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success because the evidence showed that defendants advertised, offered, and sold products using counterfeit or infringing versions of plaintiff's GJX trademark in a manner likely to confuse consumers.
3. The evidence supported a finding that plaintiff would suffer immediate and irreparable injury without an injunction, that the balance of harms favored plaintiff, and that the public interest favored preventing consumer confusion and protecting legitimate trademark interests.
4. The court could recommend an asset freeze and related restraints as preliminary equitable relief to preserve the availability of a potential accounting of defendants' profits and other permanent relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“To obtain a preliminary injunction, Plaintiff must establish “(1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits; (2) that irreparable injury will be suffered if the relief is not granted; (3) that the threatened injury

outweighs the harm the relief would inflict on the non-movant; and (4) that the entry of the relief would serve the public interest.”” (Legal Standard)

“Each Defendant and any person in active concert or participation with them who has actual notice of this Order shall be preliminarily restrained and enjoined from transferring or disposing of any money or other assets of Defendants until further ordered by this Court.” (Conclusion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Bridlington Bud Ltd. owns a federally registered GJX trademark, registered with the USPTO on August 9, 2022. Five defendants operated interactive Walmart.com storefronts under the aliases Turise, BBKON Direct, Junite, Tmaltide, and Muyu and allegedly advertised, offered, and sold counterfeit or infringing products bearing or using the GJX trademark. Plaintiff submitted declarations, storefront evidence, and exhibits indicating that the defendants were not authorized retailers and that their products and listings were likely to cause consumer confusion. The defendants were served electronically but did not appear or oppose the motion.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an original complaint on September 10, 2025, and an amended complaint on November 6, 2025, asserting trademark infringement under 15 U.S.C. § 1114 and false designation of origin under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a). The district court entered an ex parte temporary restraining order and authorized alternate service on November 10, 2025. Plaintiff served the defendants electronically; defendants did not respond, file papers, or appear. After a December 2, 2025 hearing at which only plaintiff's counsel appeared, the district court referred the preliminary-injunction motion to the magistrate judge, who recommended granting it. Four defendants were voluntarily dismissed before the recommendation.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo, 403 F.3d 1223, 1225-26 (11th Cir. 2005)
- Levi Strauss & Co. v. Sunrise International Trading Inc., 51 F.3d 982, 985, 987 (11th Cir. 1995)
- Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. v. Lin, No. 10-61640-CIV-HUCK, 2010 WL 11550032 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 2010)
- Reebok International, Ltd. v. Marnatech Enterprises, Inc., 970 F.2d 552, 559 (9th Cir. 1992)
- Fuller Brush Products Co. v. Fuller Brush Co., 299 F.2d 772, 777 (7th Cir. 1962)
- Federal Trade Commission v. United States Oil & Gas Corp., 748 F.2d 1431, 1433-34 (11th Cir. 1984)
- Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985)
- Henley v. Johnson, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989)
- Harrigan v. Metro-Dade Police Department Station #4, 977 F.3d 1185, 1191-92 (11th Cir. 2020)

OPINION

Bridlington Bud Ltd. v. The Partnerships, Unincorporated Associations Identified on Schedule A
PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
CASE NO. 1:25-24124-CIV-MARTINEZ
BRIDLINGTON BUD LTD.,
Plaintiff, v.

THE PARTNERSHIPS,
UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS
IDENTIFIED ON SCHEDULE A,

Defendants. _____/

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR ENTRY OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction. ECF No. 19.1 Plaintiff seeks the entry of a preliminary injunction, including the entry of an order restraining assets, against Defendants Turise, BBKON Direct, Junite, Tmaltide, and Muyu (collectively, "Defendants"),² based on alleged trademark infringement, pursuant to the Court's inherent authority, 15 U.S.C. § 1116, Fed. R. Civ. P. 65, and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a). 1 The Honorable Rodolfo A. Ruiz, II, on behalf of the Honorable Jose E. Martinez, referred Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction to the undersigned. ECF No. 20. 2 The Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction originally sought relief against all nine of the defendants referred to in the Amended Complaint as the Partnerships and Unincorporated Associations identified on Schedule A. See ECF No. 19; ECF No. 9. Schedule A can be found on the public docket, including within the Amended Complaint. See *id.* at 12; see also, e.g., ECF No. 19 at 16. On December 8, 2025, however, Plaintiff filed a notice of voluntary dismissal as to four of the nine defendants: 22Q5C, VividNest Creations, rongminhang, and COCOTINA.LI. ECF No. 25. Accordingly, this Report and Recommendation addresses Plaintiff's requests for relief only as to Defendants Turise, BBKON Direct, Junite, Tmaltide, and Muyu (collectively, "Defendants"). A Revised Schedule A listing the Defendants who are the subject of this Report and Recommendation is attached hereto. The Court held a hearing on December 2, 2025, at which only counsel for Plaintiff was present and available to provide evidence supporting Plaintiff's motion. Defendants have not responded to Plaintiff's motion, have not made any filings in this case, and have not appeared in this matter, either individually or through counsel. Having reviewed Plaintiff's motion, the pertinent portions of the record, and the relevant legal authorities, and for the reasons discussed below, the undersigned RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS that Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 19, be GRANTED.

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff is the owner of the federally registered trademark (the "GJX Trademark") identified in

Plaintiff's Amended Complaint and in Paragraph 3 of the Declaration of Yongkang Du. ECF No. 9 at ¶ 8; ECF No. 10-3 at ¶ 3; ECF No. 9-1. The GJX Trademark was registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on August 9, 2022 and remains in effect. ECF No. 10-3 at ¶¶ 3-4; ECF No. 9-1. Defendants, operating under the seller aliases identified on Schedule A (the "Seller Aliases") through fully interactive online storefronts on the Walmart.com e-commerce platform,³ have advertised, promoted, offered for sale, or sold infringing and counterfeit products bearing or using the GJX Trademark. ECF No. 10-2 at ¶ 8; ECF No. 10-3 at ¶¶ 8-10; ECF No. 10-4. Each Defendant expressly offers to ship the infringing products nationwide, including to the State of Florida. ECF No. 10-3 at ¶ 10. Plaintiff has submitted sufficient evidence showing that each Defendant has infringed on the GJX Trademark. See ECF No. 10-4; see also ECF No. 10-3 at ¶¶ 8-11; ECF No. 10-2 at ¶¶ 2,

8. Defendants are not licensed or authorized to use the GJX Trademark, and none of the

³ The e-commerce store URL for each Defendant is listed on Schedule A under the Defendants' Walmart Store URLs heading, e.g., ECF No. 9 at 16, as well as on the Revised Schedule A attached hereto. Defendants are authorized retailers of Plaintiff's genuine products. ECF No. 10-3 at ¶ 13. Plaintiff investigated Defendants' promotion of infringing and counterfeit versions of its branded products by Defendants. ECF No. 10-3 at ¶¶ 8-13; ECF No. 10-2 at ¶ 2. Plaintiff accessed each of the e-commerce stores operated under the Seller Aliases and determined that Defendants were promoting, advertising, offering for sale, and/or selling counterfeit and infringing products using the GJX Trademark. ECF No. 10-2 at ¶ 2; ECF No. 10-3 at ¶¶ 8-12. Specifically, Plaintiff visually examined the products displayed on Defendants' storefronts, including the products' appearance, listing, description, pricing, and information, and the seller information and domain name for each Seller Alias, and determined that the products were infringing and counterfeiting. ECF No. 10-3 at ¶¶ 9-12; ECF No. 10-2 at ¶¶ 2, 4. On September 10, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Complaint against Defendants for trademark infringement, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114 (Count I), and false designation of origin, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) (Count II). ECF No. 1. On November 6, 2025, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint asserting the same two claims against Defendants. ECF No. 9. On the same date, Plaintiff filed an Ex Parte Application for Entry of Temporary Restraining Order and Order Restraining Transfer of Assets, ECF No. 10, and a Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process on Defendants, ECF No. 11. On November 10, 2025, the Court entered an Order Granting Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application for Entry of Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 14, and an Order granting Plaintiff's Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process on Defendants, ECF No. 13. Pursuant to the November 10 Orders, Plaintiff served each Defendant, by e-mail and through Plaintiff's designated serving notice website, with a copy of the Amended Complaint, the Order Granting Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application for Entry of Temporary Restraining Order, and other filings in this matter. See ECF No. 17. Plaintiff subsequently served each Defendant with a copy of Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction and the Court's Order Setting Preliminary Injunction Hearing and

Briefing Schedule. See ECF No. 23.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

Plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunction pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65. To obtain a preliminary injunction, Plaintiff must establish “(1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits; (2) that irreparable injury will be suffered if the relief is not granted; (3) that the threatened injury outweighs the harm the relief would inflict on the non-movant; and (4) that the entry of the relief would serve the public interest.” *Schiavo ex. rel. Schindler v. Schiavo*, 403 F.3d 1223, 1225-26 (11th Cir. 2005); see also *Levi Strauss & Co. v. Sunrise Int’l. Trading Inc.*, 51 F.3d 982, 985 (11th Cir. 1995). As outlined below, Plaintiff submitted sufficient evidentiary support to warrant enjoining Defendants from engaging in the alleged infringing activities. See e.g., *Louis Vuitton Malletier, S.A. v. Lin*, No. 10-61640-CIV-HUCK, 2010 WL 11550032 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 2010) (granting preliminary injunction against the defendants who failed to respond or appear in the case after the plaintiff presented sufficient evidence of infringing activity to support its motion for preliminary injunction).

III. ANALYSIS

The declarations and exhibits that Plaintiff submitted in support of its motion support the following conclusions of law: A. Plaintiff has a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of its claims. Plaintiff has a strong probability of proving at trial that consumers are likely to be confused by Defendants’ advertisement, promotion, offer for sale, sale, or distribution of products using and/or bearing infringing and counterfeit versions of the GJX Trademark, and that the products Defendants are selling and promoting for sale are unauthorized copies of Plaintiff’s products that use infringing and counterfeit versions of the GJX Trademark. B. Because of the infringement upon the GJX Trademark, Plaintiff is likely to suffer immediate and irreparable injury if a preliminary injunction is not granted. The following specific facts, as set forth in Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, the instant motion, and declarations and exhibits accompanying Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application for Entry of Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 10, demonstrate that immediate and irreparable loss, damage, and injury will result to Plaintiff and to consumers if a preliminary injunction is not issued: i. Defendants own, operate, and/or control interactive e-commerce stores on Walmart.com operating under the Seller Aliases which advertise, promote, offer for sale, and/or sell counterfeit goods to consumers in the United States using or bearing infringing and/or counterfeit versions of the GJX Trademark; ii. There is good cause to believe that more counterfeit and infringing products using or bearing the GJX Trademark will appear in the marketplace; that consumers are likely to be misled, confused, and/or disappointed by the quality of these products; and that Plaintiff may suffer loss of sales for its genuine products and an unnatural erosion of the legitimate marketplace in which it operates. C. The balance of potential harm to Defendants in restraining their trade in counterfeit and infringing goods through their e-commerce stores and freezing their ill-gotten profits if a preliminary injunction is issued is far outweighed by the potential harm to Plaintiff, its reputation, and its goodwill if such relief is

not issued. D. The public interest favors issuance of a preliminary injunction to prevent consumer confusion and dispel the false impression that Defendants are operating their e-commerce stores with Plaintiff's approval and endorsement, as well as to protect Plaintiff's legitimate trademark interests. E. Under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a), Plaintiff may be entitled to recover, as an equitable remedy, the illegal profits gained through Defendants' distribution and sales of goods bearing and/or using infringing and/or counterfeit versions of the GJX Trademark. See *Reebok Int'l, Ltd. v. Marnatech Enters., Inc.*, 970 F.2d 552, 559 (9th Cir. 1992) ("An accounting of profits under § 1117(a) is not synonymous with an award of monetary damages: '[a]n accounting for profits . . . is an equitable remedy subject to the principles of equity.'" (quoting *Fuller Brush Prods. Co. v. Fuller Brush Co.*, 299 F.2d 772, 777 (7th Cir. 1962))). F. Requesting equitable relief "invokes the district court's inherent equitable powers to order preliminary relief, including an asset freeze, in order to assure the availability of permanent relief." *Levi Strauss & Co.*, 51 F.3d at 987 (citing *Federal Trade Commission v. United States Oil & Gas Corp.*, 748 F.2d 1431, 1433-34 (11th Cir. 1984)). G. In light of the inherently deceptive nature of the counterfeiting business, and the likelihood that Defendants have violated federal trademark laws, Plaintiff has good reason to believe Defendants will hide or transfer their ill-gotten assets beyond the jurisdiction of this Court unless those assets are restrained.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the undersigned RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS that Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 19, be GRANTED. The undersigned further recommends that the preliminary injunction provide as follows:

(1) Each Defendant, their affiliates, officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, confederates, and all persons acting for, with, by, through, under, or in active concert with them shall be preliminarily enjoined and restrained from: a. Using Plaintiff's GJX Trademark or any reproductions, counterfeit copies, or colorable imitations thereof in any manner in connection with the distribution, marketing, advertising, offering for sale, or sale of any product that is not a genuine GJX product or not authorized by Plaintiff to be sold in connection with Plaintiff's GJX Trademark; b. Passing off, inducing, or enabling others to sell or pass off any product as a genuine GJX product or any other product produced by Plaintiff that is not Plaintiff's or not produced under the authorization, control, or supervision of Plaintiff and approved by Plaintiff for sale under Plaintiff's GJX Trademark; c. Committing any acts calculated to cause consumers to believe that Defendants' products are those sold under the authorization, control, or supervision of Plaintiff, or are sponsored by, approved by, or otherwise connected with Plaintiff; d. Further infringing Plaintiff's GJX Trademark and/or damaging Plaintiff's goodwill; e. Otherwise competing unfairly with Plaintiff in any manner; and/or f. Shipping, delivering, holding for sale, transferring or otherwise moving, storing, distributing, returning, or otherwise disposing of, in any manner, products or inventory not manufactured by or for Plaintiff, nor authorized by Plaintiff to be sold or offered for sale, and which bear Plaintiff's GJX Trademark or any reproductions, counterfeit

copies, or colorable imitations thereof.

(2) Each Defendant and any person in active concert or participation with them who has actual notice of this Order shall be preliminarily restrained and enjoined from transferring or disposing of any money or other assets of Defendants until further ordered by this Court.

(3) Within two (2) business days of receipt of this Order, any third-party providers, including Pay Pal, Payoneer, and Walmart, Inc., shall, to the extent not already done, for any of Defendants or any of Defendants' Online Marketplace Accounts or websites: a. Locate all accounts and funds connected to Defendants, Defendants' Online Marketplace Accounts or Defendants' websites, including, but not limited to, any financial accounts connected to the information listed in Revised Schedule A attached hereto and any email addresses provided for Defendants by third parties; and b. Restrain and enjoin any such accounts or funds from transferring or disposing of money or any other assets belonging to Defendants until further ordered by this Court.

(4) Any Defendant subject to this Order may appear and move to dissolve or modify the Order on two-days' notice to Plaintiff or on shorter notice as set by this Court.

(5) Any Defendant or financial institution account holder subject to this Order may petition the Court to modify the asset restraint set out in this Order.

(6) This Preliminary Injunction shall remain in effect during the pendency of this action or until such further date set by the Court.

(7) Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(5)(D) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c), Plaintiff shall maintain its previously posted bond in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$5,000.00), to pay for any costs or damages to which any party may be entitled for a wrongful injunction or restraint, during the pendency of this action, or until further order of the Court. In the Court's discretion, the bond may be subject to increase should a motion be made in the interest of justice.

(8) Additionally, for the purpose of providing additional notice of this proceeding and all other pleadings, orders, and documents filed herein, the owners, operators and/or administrators of the ecommerce stores and/or financial institutions, payment processors, banks, escrow services, and money transmitters, and marketplace platforms, including but not limited to, PayPal, Payoneer, and Walmart, Inc., and their related companies and affiliates shall, at Plaintiff's request and to the extent not already done, provide Plaintiff's counsel, with any e-mail address known to be associated with Defendants' respective e-commerce stores.

(9) This Preliminary Injunction shall no longer apply to any Defendant or associated e-commerce store name dismissed from this action or as to which Plaintiff has withdrawn its request for a preliminary injunction. Pursuant to Local Magistrate Rule 4(b), the Court finds good cause to EXPEDITE the period to serve and file written objections to this Report and Recommendation, if any, with the Honorable Jose E. Martinez, United States District Judge. Accordingly, the parties shall have until December 12, 2025 to file and serve any written objections to this Report and

Recommendation. Failing to file timely objections will bar a de novo determination by the District Judge of any issue addressed in the Report and Recommendation, will constitute a waiver of a party’s “right to challenge on appeal the district court’s order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions,” and will only allow appellate review of the district court order “for plain error if necessary in the interests of justice.” 11th Cir. R. 3-1; 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); Henley v. Johnson, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989); see also Harrigan v. Metro-Dade Police Dep t Station #4, 977 F.3d 1185, 1191-92 (11th Cir. 2020). RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDED in Chambers in Miami, Florida, on this 9th day of December 2025.

EDUARDO I. Me |

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ce: Hon. Jose E. Martinez Hon. Rodolfo A. Ruiz, II Counsel of Record 10

REVISED SCHEDULE A

Def.	#	Seller	Aliases	Defendants’	Walmart	Store	URLs	1	Turise
		https://www.walmart.com/global/seller/102761707			2		BBKON		Direct
		https://www.walmart.com/global/seller/101348588				3			Junit
		https://www.walmart.com/global/seller/102758244				7			Tmaltide
		https://www.walmart.com/global/seller/101227312				8			Muyu
		https://www.walmart.com/global/seller/102490833							