

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
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PLAYBOY ENTERTAINMENT GROUP
INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HAPPY MUTANTS, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 17-8140 FMO (PLAx)

ORDER

Having reviewed and considered all the briefing filed with respect to defendant Happy Mutants LLC’s (“Happy Mutants” or “defendant”) Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff Playboy Entertainment Group Inc.’s First Amended Complaint (Dkt. 19, “Motion”), the court finds that oral argument is not necessary to resolve the Motion, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; Local Rule 7-15; Willis v. Pac. Mar. Ass’n, 244 F.3d 675, 684 n. 2 (9th Cir. 2001), and concludes as follows.

Many motions to dismiss can be avoided if the parties confer in good faith (as required by Local Rule 7-3), especially for perceived defects in a complaint, answer or counterclaim that could be corrected by amendment. See Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003) (where a motion to dismiss is granted, a district court should provide leave to amend unless it is clear that the complaint could not be saved by any amendment). Moreover, a party has the right to amend the complaint “once as a matter of course[.]” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1). Even after a complaint has been amended or a responsive pleading has been served, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provide that “[t]he court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). The Ninth Circuit requires that this policy

1 favoring amendment be applied with “extreme liberality.” Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan,
2 Inc., 244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 2001); Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose, 893 F.2d 1074,
3 1079 (9th Cir. 1990).

4 The court will grant defendant’s Motion and dismiss plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint
5 (Dkt. 14, “FAC”) with leave to amend. In preparing the Second Amended Complaint, plaintiff shall
6 carefully evaluate the contentions set forth in defendant’s Motion. For example, the court is
7 skeptical that plaintiff has sufficiently alleged facts to support either its inducement or material
8 contribution theories of copyright infringement.¹ (See, generally, Dkt. 14, FAC at ¶¶ 8-22); see
9 Tarantino v. Gawker Media, LLC, 2014 WL 2434647, *3 (C.D. Cal. 2014) (“An allegation that a
10 defendant merely provided the means to accomplish an infringing activity is insufficient to establish
11 a claim for copyright infringement. Rather, liability exists if the defendant engages in personal
12 conduct that encourages or assists the infringement.”) (internal citations omitted); Perfect 10, Inc.
13 v. Giganews, Inc., 847 F.3d 657, 672 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 138 S.Ct. 504 (2017) (“We have
14 described the inducement theory as having four elements: (1) the distribution of a device or
15 product, (2) acts of infringement, (3) an object of promoting its use to infringe copyright, and (4)
16 causation.”) (internal quotation marks omitted).

17 Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 18 1. Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Complaint (**Document No. 19**) is **granted**.
- 19 2. Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint (**Document No. 14**) is **dismissed with leave**
20 **to amend**.
- 21 3. If plaintiff still wishes to pursue this action, it is granted until **February 26, 2018**, to
22 file a second amended complaint attempting to cure the deficiencies set forth above as well as the
23 other alleged defects outlined in defendant’s Motion. The court expects that defendant will agree
24 to any amendments that will or attempt to cure the alleged defects.

25
26 _____
27 ¹ Defendant’s “fair use” argument is premature at this stage. A motion to dismiss under
28 Rule 12(b)(6) cannot be granted based on an affirmative defense unless that “defense raises no
disputed issues of fact.” Scott v. Kuhlmann, 746 F.2d 1377, 1378 (9th Cir. 1984) (per curiam).

