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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential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)