1 2 3 4 5	Mark G. Tratos (Bar No. 1086) Tyler R. Andrews (Bar. No. 9499) Shauna L.Welsh (Bar No. 11320) GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 400 North Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone: (702) 792-3773 Facsimile: (702) 792-9002		
6	Counsel for Plaintiff		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
9	Two Plus Two Publishing, LLC a Nevada limited liability company;	Case No.	
10	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	
	V.	(1) Cybersquatting under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)	
13	Anthony Scocozza, an individual.	(2)Trademark Infringement under 15 U.S.C. § 1114	
14	Defendant.	(3) Unfair Competition under 15 U.S.C. § 125(a)	
		(4)Copyright Infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 101, et seq.	
17		(5)State Trademark Infringement Under N.R.S. 600.420	
18		(6) Common Law Trademark Infringement	
19		(7)Deceptive Trade Practices under N.R.S. 598.0903, et seq.	
20		(8)Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage	
21			
22	For its complaint against Defendant, Two Plus Two Publishing, LLC ("Two Plus Two")		
23	complains and alleges as follows:		
24	NATURE OF ACTION		
25	This is an action for cybersquatting, trademark infringement, copyright infringement and		
26	unfair competition under federal statutes, with pendent claims for common law trademark		
27	infringement, state trademark infringement, state deceptive trade practices, and intentional		
28		1	
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Tyler R. Andrews (Bar. No. 9499) Shauna L. Welsh (Bar No. 11320) GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 3 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 400 North Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone: (702) 792-3773 Facsimile: (702) 792-9002 Counsel for Plaintiff 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT Two Plus Two Publishing, LLC a Nevada limited liability company; 10 Plaintiff, 11 v. 12 13 Anthony Scocozza, an individual. 14 Defendant. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 For its complaint against Defendant, Tocomplains and alleges as follows: 21 22 NATURE This is an action for cybersquatting, tra unfair competition under federal statutes, we 27 infringement, state trademark infringement,	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

interference with prospective economic advantage. Two Plus Two seeks damages, attorneys' fees, costs, and preliminary and permanent injunctive relief.

JURISDICTION

- 1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1338(a). This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Two Plus Two's state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).
- 2. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant based upon the following: (a) he operates an interactive web site on the Internet that is both accessible and specifically addressed to various residents of the State of Nevada; (b) the domain name and web site at issue contain information and material that directly infringe the intellectual property of Two Plus Two, a Nevada limited liability company with a principal place of business within this District; and (c) Defendant was a member of Two Plus Two's Nevada-based website and communication forums (the "Forums") and maintained continuous and systematic contact with Two Plus Two and its members via electronic communication occurring within this District; and (d) Defendant committed tortious acts that he knew or should have known would cause injury to Two Plus Two within the State of Nevada.
- 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c). Venue lies in the unofficial Southern Division of this Court.

PARTIES

- 4. Two Plus Two is a Nevada limited liability company with its principal place of business in Henderson, Nevada.
- 5. Defendant Anthony Scocozza ("Defendant") is an individual who, upon information and belief, resides in Scranton, Pennsylvania.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

6. Two Plus Two, a Nevada limited liability company with its principal place of business in Henderson, Nevada, is the owner of the Two Plus Two publishing company and the sole member of Two Plus Two Interactive, LLC ("Two Plus Two Interactive"), the owner and operator of the Two Plus Two Forums online forums and poker information community (the

"Forums"). Two Plus Two published its first book in 1987. The Forums first went online in 1997.

- 7. Since Two Plus Two published its first book in 1987, Two Plus Two has continuously used the trademarks TWO PLUS TWO, 2+2, 2+2=4, TWO PLUS TWO PUBLISHING, and TWO PLUS TWO FORUMS (the "TWO PLUS TWO Marks") in connection with advertising and promoting its Forums and publications throughout the world. The TWO PLUS TWO Marks are among the most recognized and respected names in poker theory and gaming related publishing and internet communities.
- 8. Two Plus Two and its founder, Mason S. Malmuth, have become leading authorities on poker and gaming strategy in the United States and internationally. Throughout its existence, Two Plus Two has sold over two million books worldwide in over thirty-four different titles and in many different languages and countries. Similarly, Two Plus Two's Forums maintain hundreds of thousands of individual members and poker theory customers throughout the world.
- 9. Two Plus Two and its affiliates and subsidiaries have spent substantial sums of money to develop, advertise and promote the TWO PLUS TWO Marks in print, broadcast media and on the Internet through the Two Plus Two website and the Forums, accessible throughout the United States and around the world at <twoplustwo.com>. In addition, consumers of Two Plus Two's publications buy substantial numbers of books through the Two Plus Two website and Forums.
- 10. Two Plus Two has made extensive use of the TWO PLUS TWO Marks on, among other things, signage, wearing apparel, publications, internet communities, online forums, magazines, and sales and promotional materials, and has obtained (or applied for) federal registration for the TWO PLUS TWO Marks for various goods and services, including but not limited to:
 - (a) 2+2=4 for publication of books (U.S. Reg. No. 1,779,281);
 - (b) 2+2=4 (& design) for books, publishing, and materials on gaming and gambling, namely, poker and card play. (U.S. Ser. No. 77013529);

(c) TWO PLUS TWO for a series of books on the topics of gaming, poker and card games. (U.S. Ser. No. 77824666);
 (d) TWO PLUS TWO for entertainment and education services, namely, providing an Internet website in the field of entertainment, gaming, poker and card games; Providing instructional information on gaming, poker and card games via an Internet website; Publishing services, namely, book

publishing and publishing of electronic publication.

(e) TWO PLUS TWO for providing on-line forums for transmission of messages among computer users; Internet broadcasting services. (U.S. Ser. No. 77824872).

(U.S. Ser. No.

None of these federal trademark applications has been abandoned, withdrawn or denied.

77824916):

- 11. Two Plus Two has also applied for and received Nevada state trademark registrations, including but not limited to:
 - (a) TWO PLUS TWO PUBLISHING for publication of books. (NV Reg. No. SM00260475-001);
- 12. Based on its federal and state trademark registrations, applications and extensive use, Two Plus Two has the exclusive right to use its TWO PLUS TWO Marks in connection with a variety of goods and services.
- 13. The prominence and marketing of Two Plus Two as the leading gambling and poker theory publisher in the world has resulted in the TWO PLUS TWO names and marks being distinctive for publishing, entertainment, education, and online forum services.
- 14. Two Plus Two also owns the following books and publications (the "Copyrighted Works") and has obtained copyright registrations with the U.S. Copyright Office, including but not limited to:
 - (a) U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX0003888126/TX0003483701 entitled "High-Low-Split Poker: Seven-Card Stud and Omaha Eight-or-Better: For Advanced Players/by Ray Zee;"
 - (b) U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX0004773210 entitled "Poker Tournament Strategies/by Sylvester Suzuki;"
 - (c) U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX0005258327 entitled "Psychology of Poker/by Alan N. Schoonmaker;"

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- (d) U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX 0006860097 entitled "Tournament Poker for Advanced Players Expanded Edition;"
- U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX0006170543 entitled "Getting (e) started in Hold 'Em;"
- (f) U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX0006410586 entitled "Harrington on Hold 'EM: Vol. 3, the Workbook;"
- (g) U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX0006109562 entitled "Harrignton on Hold 'Em: Expert Strategy for No-Limit Tournaments: Vol. 1, Strategic Play;"
- (h) U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX0006414878 entitled "Professional Poker Dealer's Handbook/Dan Paymar, Donna Harris, and Mason Malmuth;"
- (i) U.S. Federal Copyright Registration TX0006016021 entitled "Small Stakes Hold 'Em: Winning Big with Expert Play/by Ed Miller, David Sklansky, and Mason Malmuth.
- 15. On or about January 28, 2009, Defendant registered the <twoplustwo.me> Internet domain name (the "Infringing Domain Name") with GoDaddy.com, a registrar for This domain name contains the entirety of Plaintiff's TWO PLUS TWO domain names. trademark.
- 16. Some time after registration, Defendant linked the Infringing Domain Name to an active internet site providing information and links to poker strategy and various online gaming services that compete with those provided by Plaintiff.
- 17. By registering and/or using a domain name containing the entirety of Two Plus Two's trademarks, Defendant was and is attempting to trade on the goodwill of Two Plus Two.
- 18. By registering and/or using a domain name containing Two Plus Two's trademarks, Defendant was and is attempting to create an association between the Infringing Domain Name and the TWO PLUS TWO Marks.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 19. The TWO PLUS TWO Marks at issue in this case were distinctive at the time Defendant registered the Infringing Domain Name.
- 20. Upon information and belief, the Defendant registered the Infringing Domain Name with the bad faith intent to profit from the TWO PLUS TWO Marks.
- 21. Upon information and belief, the Defendant has no trademark or other intellectual property rights in the Infringing Domain Name.
- 22. Upon information and belief, the Defendant had no prior use of the Infringing Domain Name in connection with the bona fide offering of any goods or services.
- 23. Upon information and belief, the Defendant intended to divert customers from the Two Plus Two website and Forums, to web sites accessible under the Infringing Domain Name in a manner that could harm the goodwill represented by the TWO PLUS TWO Marks.
- 24. The TWO PLUS TWO Marks incorporated in Defendant's domain name are distinctive and famous.
- 25. Upon information and belief, the Defendant did not believe or have reasonable grounds to believe that the use of the domain name was a fair use or otherwise lawful.
- 26. The Defendant's website also contains Plaintiff's copyrighted books and material exclusively owned and controlled by Two Plus Two, including but not limited to the Theory of Poker, Harrington on Hold 'Em and Tournament Poker for Advanced Players in violation of The Copyright Act of 1976, 17 U.S.C. § 101 et seq.
- 27. By copying Two Plus Two's copyrighted poker books and related poker content without Two Plus Two's authorization or permission, Defendant was and is infringing upon Two Plus Two's exclusive rights in its Copyrighted Works.
- 28. Upon information and belief, Defendant was a registered member of Two Plus Two's Forums for several years. Defendant used his membership on Two Plus Two's forums to make repeated offensive, improper, and disruptive posts and messages that were prohibited under the terms of conditions of the Two Plus Two Forums.
- 29. Upon information and belief, Defendant owns numerous other websites and/or domain names that infringe Two Plus Two's intellectual property and/or cause economic harm

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

to Two Plus Two. Defendant has repeatedly made offensive and improper posts and messages on such websites that harm the reputation of Two Plus Two and interfere with the economic advantages of Two Plus Two.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Cybersquatting under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d))

- 30. Two Plus Two incorporates the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 31. Defendant has registered, trafficked in, and/or used a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to and/or dilutive of Two Plus Two's trademarks, which were distinctive and/or famous at the time of registration of the Infringing Domain Name.
- 32. Upon information and belief, Defendant has or had bad-faith intent to profit from Two Plus Two's trademarks.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of such conduct, Two Plus Two has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary loss and irreparable injury to its business, reputation, and goodwill.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Trademark Infringement under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114)

- 34. Two Plus Two incorporates the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 35. Defendant has used and/or is using in commerce a domain name which contains Two Plus Two's trademarks, and, thus is confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's names and trademarks.
- 36. Defendant's use in commerce of the TWO PLUS TWO Marks and/or a mark confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's trademarks for Defendant's services constitutes a reproduction, copying, counterfeiting, and colorable imitation of Two Plus Two's trademarks in a manner that is likely to cause confusion or mistake or is likely to deceive consumers.
- 37. By using the TWO PLUS TWO Marks and/or marks confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's trademarks with the knowledge that Two Plus Two owns and has used, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

continues to use, its trademarks in Las Vegas, across the United States, and around the world, Defendant has intended to cause confusion, cause mistake, or deceive consumers.

- 38. Defendant is using a mark identical and/or confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's trademarks in connection with the sale, offering for sale or advertising of services in a manner that is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive consumers as to affiliation, connection, or association with Two Plus Two or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of Defendant's services or commercial activities by Two Plus Two.
- 39. Defendant's use of the TWO PLUS TWO Marks and/or marks confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's trademarks has created a likelihood of confusion among consumers who may falsely believe that Defendant's business or web site is associated with Two Plus Two's publications or online services and Forums, or that Two Plus Two sponsors or approves of Defendant's services or commercial activities.
- 40. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's infringement, Two Plus Two has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary loss and irreparable injury to its business, reputation, and goodwill.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Unfair Competition under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))

- 41. Two Plus Two incorporates the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 42. Defendant's use in commerce of marks identical and/or confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's trademarks in connection with Defendant's services, web site, and Internet domain name, constitutes a false designation of origin and/or a false or misleading description or representation of fact, which is likely to cause confusion, cause mistake, or deceive as to affiliation, connection, or association with Two Plus Two, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of Defendant's services or commercial activities.
- 43. Defendant's use in commerce of the TWO PLUS TWO marks and/or marks confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's trademarks with the knowledge that Two Plus Two owns and has used, and continues to use, its trademarks constitutes intentional conduct by

44. As a direct and proximate result of such unfair competition, Two Plus Two has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary loss and irreparable injury to its business, reputation, and goodwill.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Copyright Infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 101 et seq.)

- 45. Two Plus Two incorporates the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 46. Two Plus Two's Copyrighted Works constitute copyrightable subject matter within the meaning of Section 102(a)(1) of The Copyright Act of 1976 ("The Copyright Act").
- 47. Two Plus Two's Copyrighted Works are fixed in a tangible medium of expression from which they can be perceived. Two Plus Two has taken all reasonable steps necessary to secure its copyrights including obtaining United States copyright registrations from the United States Copyright Office.
- 48. Two Plus Two owns valid copyright registrations in the Copyrighted Works is the owner of all rights, title and interest in and to the Copyrighted Works, and has done nothing to abandon those rights or place the Copyrighted Works in the public domain.
- 49. Upon information and belief and without knowledge, approval or consent of Two Plus Two, Defendant willfully infringed Two Plus Two's copyrights by copying, reproducing, duplicating and using the Copyrighted Works for Defendant's own commercial purposes with full knowledge that such acts were an infringement of Two Plus Two copyrights, and such acts being in violation of Two Plus Two's exclusive rights under The Copyright Act.
- 50. Defendant's past acts violate Two Plus Two's exclusive rights under section 106 of The Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 106, and constitute willful and intentional infringement of the Copyrighted Works.
- 51. Defendant has realized unjust profits, gains and advantages as a proximate result of his infringement.

- 52. As evidenced by Defendant's exact copying and prominent use of Two Plus Two's Copyrighted Works to further his business activities, Defendant has infringed upon Two Plus Two's copyrights.
- 53. As a direct and proximate result of such copyright infringement, Two Plus Two has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary loss and irreparable injury to its business, reputation, and goodwill.
- 54. Two Plus Two has complied in all respects with the statutory requirements for the creation and enforcement of the Copyrighted Works; therefore Two Plus Two is entitled to an award of statutory damages for Defendant's infringement, or in the alternative, Plaintiff's actual damages and Defendant's profits.
- 55. Defendant's conduct has made it necessary for Two Plus Two to engage the services of legal counsel to file this lawsuit and therefore, Two Plus Two is entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys and costs incurred in connection with this action.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Nevada State Trademark Infringement – N.R.S. § 600.420)

- 56. Two Plus Two incorporates the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 57. Two Plus Two has mark registrations in the State of Nevada for the TWO PLUS TWO Marks.
- 58. Defendant used, without Two Plus Two's consent, reproductions, counterfeits, copies and/or colorful imitations of the TWO PLUS TWO Marks in connection with the sale, offering for sale and/or advertising of Defendant's services.
- 59. Defendant willfully reproduced, counterfeited, copied and/or colorfully imitated the TWO PLUS TWO Marks and applied or caused to be applied that reproduction, counterfeit, copy or colorable imitation to Defendant's services and advertisements for those services.

	60.	Defendant's use of the TWO PLUS TWO Marks (or reproductions, counterfeits,
copies	or colo	orful imitations thereof) is likely to cause confusion or mistake among consumers
or resu	ılt in de	ception as to the source or origin of such goods and services.

- 61. Unless the Defendant is enjoined and prohibited from continuing to engage in his infringements upon the TWO PLUS TWO Marks, Defendant will continue to infringe upon the TWO PLUS TWO marks.
- 62. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's trademark infringement, Two Plus Two has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary loss and irreparable injury to its business, reputation and goodwill.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Common Law Trademark Infringement)

- 63. Two Plus Two incorporates the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 64. By virtue of having used and continuing to use its trademarks, Two Plus Two has acquired common law rights in those marks.
- 65. Defendant's use of marks identical and/or confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's trademarks infringes Two Plus Two's common law rights in its trademarks, and this use is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception among consumers, who will believe that Defendant's services, web site and/or Internet domain name originates from, or is affiliated with, or endorsed by Two Plus Two when, in fact, it is not.
- 66. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's infringement of Two Plus Two's common law trademark rights under Nevada and other common law, Two Plus Two has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary damages and irreparable injury to its business, reputation, and goodwill.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Deceptive Trade Practices under N.R.S. § 598.0915)

67. Two Plus Two incorporates the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

- 68. Upon information and belief, in the course of conducting Defendant's business, Defendant knowingly made false representations as to affiliation, connection and/or association with Two Plus Two by using a mark confusingly similar to Two Plus Two's trademarks and otherwise engaged in deceptive trade practices.
- 69. As the direct and proximate result of Defendant's conduct, Two Plus Two has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary damages and irreparable injury to its business, reputation, and goodwill.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage)

- 70. Two Plus Two incorporates the allegations in the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 71. Upon information and belief, at the time Defendant adopted and began using Two Plus Two's name and marks and since that time, Defendant knew and has known that Two Plus Two is in the business of providing gaming and poker related publications and online services through its website and Forums.
- 72. Upon information and belief, Defendant committed acts intended or designed to disrupt Two Plus Two's prospective economic advantage arising from advertising and/or providing these services.
- 73. Defendant's actions have disrupted or are intended to disrupt Two Plus Two's business by, among other things, diverting web users away from Two Plus Two's web sites and Forums.
 - 74. Defendant has no legal right, privilege or justification for his conduct.
- 75. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's intentional interference with Two Plus Two's prospective economic advantage, Two Plus Two has suffered, and will continue to suffer, monetary damages and irreparable injury.
- 76. Based on the intentional, willful and malicious nature of Defendant's actions, Two Plus Two is entitled to recover exemplary damages and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with this action.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Two Plus Two respectfully prays that the Court grant the following relief:

- A. A preliminary and permanent injunction prohibiting Defendant, his respective officers, agents, servants, employees and/or all persons acting in concert or participation with him, from: (1) using the TWO PLUS TWO Marks or confusingly similar variations thereof, alone or in combination with any other letters, words, letter strings, phrases or designs, in commerce or in connection with any business or for any other purpose (including, but not limited to, on web sites and in domain names); and (2) registering, owning, leasing, selling, or trafficking in any domain names containing the TWO PLUS TWO Marks or confusingly similar variations thereof, alone or in combination with any other letters, words, phrases or designs;
- B. A preliminary and permanent injunction requiring the current domain name registrar to transfer the <twoplustwo.me> domain name to Two Plus Two;
- C. An award of compensatory, consequential, statutory, and punitive damages to Two Plus Two in an amount to be determined at trial;
- D. An award of interest, costs and attorneys' fees incurred by Two Plus Two in prosecuting this action; and
 - E. All other relief to which Two Plus Two is entitled.

DATED: December 4, 2009.

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

<u>/s/ Tyler R. Andrews</u>
Mark G. Tratos (Bar No. 1086)
Tyler Andrews (Bar No. 9499)
Shauna L. Welsh (Bar No. 11320)
3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
Suite 500 North
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
Counsel for Plaintiff