

1 RICHARD H. ZAITLEN (SBN 63283)
richard.zaitlen@pillsburylaw.com
2 ROBERT WALLAN (SBN 126480)
robert.wallan@pillsburylaw.com
3 JENNIFER A. SEIGLE (SBN 285670)
jennifer.seigle@pillsburylaw.com
4 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
5 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
6 Facsimile No.: (213) 629-1033

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff
In-N-Out Burgers

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

12 IN-N-OUT BURGERS, a California Corporation, 13 14 Plaintiff, 15 vs. 16 DOORDASH, a California company, 17 Defendant.	}	Case No. 8:15-cv-1826 IN-N-OUT BURGERS’ COMPLAINT FOR TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT AND UNFAIR COMPETITION JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
--	---	--

19
20 Plaintiff IN-N-OUT BURGERS, a California Corporation (“Plaintiff” or “In-
21 N-Out”) by and through its undersigned Counsel, files its Complaint and seeks a
22 permanent injunction against Defendant DoorDash (“Defendant” or “Door Dash”).
23 In support of its Complaint, Plaintiff alleges as follows:

24 **NATURE OF THE CASE**

25 1. This action concerns Defendant’s acts of trademark infringement and
26 false designation of origin under the Lanham Act as well as unfair competition under
27 both state and federal laws.
28

1 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2 2. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 15
3 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338 and 1367. Plaintiff’s claims are, in part,
4 based on violations of the Lanham Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051, *et seq.* The
5 Court has jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1338(b),
6 and 1367.

7 3. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant, and for similar
8 reasons, venue is proper in the Central District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
9 § 1391(b). Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendant operates its food
10 delivery business throughout the Central District of California, including throughout
11 Los Angeles, Orange County, and the San Fernando and Conejo Valleys. Further,
12 upon information and belief, a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise
13 to Plaintiff’s claims occurred in this District, where Defendant advertises and
14 operates delivery services. The effects of Defendant’s infringing acts have been felt
15 in the State of California and in this District, where Plaintiff is located.

16 **THE PARTIES**

17 4. Plaintiff is a California corporation having its principal place of business
18 in Irvine, California. Plaintiff operates a highly recognizable chain of restaurants,
19 with over 300 locations in the United States.

20 5. Upon information and belief, Defendant is a California company, having
21 a principle place of business at 531 Lasuen Mall, Stanford, California 94305.
22 Defendant provides on-demand food delivery from numerous restaurants to
23 customers who place orders through a mobile app or an Internet website.

24 **PLAINTIFF’S BUSINESS AND MARKS**

25 6. Founded in 1948, Plaintiff operates a successful and popular chain of
26 quick service restaurants offering made-to-order hamburger sandwiches and other
27 products and services. Since at least as early as 1960, Plaintiff has continuously used
28 federally registered trademarks and service marks comprising the words IN-N-OUT

1 and IN-N-OUT BURGER as well as logos related to these marks in interstate
 2 commerce in connection with its advertising, promotion, offering to provide, and
 3 providing specially-prepared burgers and other products and services to consumers in
 4 its restaurants.

5 7. Celebrated for its fresh food and other high standards of quality,
 6 Plaintiff consistently rates as the top quick service restaurant in customer satisfaction
 7 surveys. In 2015, Zagat users rated Plaintiff as the favorite chain restaurant in Los
 8 Angeles. In April 2015, Plaintiff earned the top ranking from consumers for the
 9 third year in a row in the Limited-Service category in Nation's Restaurant News'
 10 annual Consumer Picks report. In 2014, the National Restaurant Association ranked
 11 Plaintiff as the nation's top hamburger spot, "head and shoulders above the rest."
 12 Also in 2014, OC Metro magazine named Plaintiff as the most trustworthy brand in
 13 Orange County for the second consecutive year, based on a consumer survey. In
 14 2013, the Quick Service Restaurant (QSR) Benchmark Study rated Plaintiff as
 15 "America's Favorite Burger Brand." In 2011, Zagat's fast food survey lauded
 16 Plaintiff as the number one large quick service chain in the "Top Food" category. In
 17 2010, Consumer Reports ranked Plaintiff as the nation's top burger sandwich chain.

18 8. Plaintiff has amassed tremendous consumer goodwill over the decades.
 19 It is an iconic brand, and its products and services have acquired renown and a
 20 fiercely devoted fan base throughout the country, including in its home state of
 21 California.

22 9. Plaintiff's Federal Trademark and Service Mark Registrations for the
 23 "IN-N-OUT" mark include the following word and design marks (hereinafter, the
 24 "Registered Marks") registered on the Principal Register of the United States Patent
 25 and Trademark Office, all of which are incontestable pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1065:

Exhibit	Mark	U.S.P.T.O. Registration No.	Registration Date	Description of Services or Goods
A	IN-N-OUT BURGER	1031096	January 20,	Cheeseburgers, hamburgers,





Exhibit	Mark	U.S.P.T.O. Registration No.	Registration Date	Description of Services or Goods
	and Design 		1976	French fried potatoes, hot coffee, and milk (IC 030); Restaurant services and carryout restaurant services (IC 042)
B	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	1023506	Oct. 21, 1975	Restaurant services and carryout restaurant services (IC 042)
C	IN-N-OUT BURGER	1031095	Jan. 20, 1976	Cheeseburgers, hamburgers, French fried potatoes, hot coffee, and milk (IC 30); Restaurant services and carry-out restaurant services (IC 042)
D	IN-N-OUT	1085163	Feb. 2, 1978	Restaurant services and carry-out restaurant services (IC 042)
E	IN-N-OUT	1101628	Sep. 5, 1978	Milk and French fried potatoes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 029); Lemonade and soft drinks for consumption on or off the premises (IC 032)
F	IN-N-OUT	1101638	Sep. 5, 1978	Cheeseburgers, hamburgers, hot coffee and milkshakes for consumption on or off premises (IC 030)
G	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	1514689	Nov. 29, 1988	Shirts (IC 025)
H	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	1516560	Dec. 13, 1988	Restaurant services and carry-out restaurant services (IC 042); Hamburger sandwiches and cheeseburger sandwiches, hot coffee, and milkshakes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 030); Milk and French fried potatoes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 029); Lemonade and soft drinks for consumption on or off the premises (IC 032).




Exhibit	Mark	U.S.P.T.O. Registration No.	Registration Date	Description of Services or Goods
I	IN-N-OUT and Design 	1522799	Jan. 31, 1989	Restaurant services and carry-out restaurant services (IC 042); Hamburger sandwiches and cheeseburger sandwiches, hot coffee, and milkshakes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 030); Milk and French fried potatoes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 029); Lemonade and soft drinks for consumption on or off the premises (IC 032)
J	IN-N-OUT and Design 	1525982	Feb. 21, 1989	Restaurant services and carry-out restaurant services (IC 042); Hamburger sandwiches and cheeseburger sandwiches, hot coffee, and milkshakes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 030); Milk and French fried potatoes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 029); Lemonade and soft drinks for consumption on or off the premises (IC 032)
K	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	1528455	Mar. 7, 1989	Restaurant services and carry-out restaurant services (IC 042); Hamburger sandwiches and cheeseburger sandwiches, hot coffee, and milkshakes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 030); Milk and French fried potatoes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 029); Lemonade and soft drinks for consumption on or off the premises (IC 032)






Exhibit	Mark	U.S.P.T.O. Registration No.	Registration Date	Description of Services or Goods
L	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	1528456	Mar. 7, 1989	Restaurant services and carry-out restaurant services (IC 042); Hamburger sandwiches and cheeseburger sandwiches, hot coffee, and milkshakes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 030); Milk and French fried potatoes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 029); Lemonade and soft drinks for consumption on or off the premises (IC 032)
M	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	1539451	May 16, 1989	Restaurant services and carry-out restaurant services (IC 042); Hamburger sandwiches and cheeseburger sandwiches, hot coffee, and milkshakes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 030); Milk and French fried potatoes for consumption on or off the premises (IC 029); Lemonade and soft drinks for consumption on or off the premises (IC 032)
N	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	1960015	Mar. 5, 1996	Watches (IC 014); Gift certificates (IC 016); Coffee mugs and thermal mugs (IC 021); Baseball caps, letterman's jackets, and cooks aprons (IC 025); Retail and mail order services featuring watches, novelty jewelry, key rings, drinking utensils, clothing, aprons and sporting equipment (IC 042)
O	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	2026720	Dec. 31, 1996	Hamburger and cheeseburger sandwiches for consumption on and off the premises (IC 030)
P	IN-N-OUT	2217307	Jan. 12, 1999	Watches (IC 014); Decals in the nature of bumper stickers; publications in the nature of house organs; Gift certificates (IC 016); Backpacks (IC 018); Coffee mugs and thermal mugs

Exhibit	Mark	U.S.P.T.O. Registration No.	Registration Date	Description of Services or Goods
				(IC 021); Shirts, baseball caps, letterman's jackets, and cooks aprons (IC 025)
Q	IN-N-OUT BURGER and Design 	3367471	Jan. 15, 2008	Financial sponsorship of race cars and race car drivers (IC 036)

10. Registrations for a relevant sub-set of these Registered Marks are attached hereto as **Exhibits A-Q**.

11. Plaintiff owns all right, title and interest in and to the Registered Marks, and has obtained Federal Trademark and Service Mark Registrations for the Registered Marks for a wide range of food and other products and services, including, *inter alia*, restaurant services, hamburger and cheeseburger sandwiches, French fried potatoes, hot coffee, milkshakes, bumper stickers, backpacks and coffee mugs. Plaintiff also uses the Registered Marks for mobile restaurant services, and specifically on its food trucks in California and Texas. Plaintiff has been using its Registered Marks on food trucks for more than four decades in California, and for several years in Texas.

12. The Registered Marks have been used in interstate commerce to identify and distinguish Plaintiff's products and services for decades, and they serve as symbols of Plaintiff's quality, reputation and goodwill.

13. Through its restaurants and online store, Plaintiff has sold and continues to sell goods throughout the United States.

14. Plaintiff makes use of its Registered Marks in interstate commerce by displaying them on product packaging, menus, signage, mobile food trucks, promotional materials and advertising materials.

1 23. Despite the fact that Defendant is in no way affiliated with Plaintiff,
2 Defendant has advertised, and continues to advertise, that it delivers food from
3 Plaintiff’s restaurants. In conjunction with these advertisements, Defendant’s
4 website and promotional materials feature a mock In-N-Out logo (the “Imitation
5 Logo”), which is a colorable imitation of Plaintiff’s Registered Marks. Upon
6 information and belief, the Imitation Logo is intended to, and has, confused
7 consumers as to Defendant’s authority to deliver Plaintiff’s food items. A sampling
8 of Defendant’s promotional materials featuring the Imitation Logo is attached hereto
9 as **Exhibit R**.

10 24. In addition, without authorization from Plaintiff, Defendant has used and
11 continues to use the Registered Marks to advertise and promote its delivery business.

12 25. A sampling of Defendant’s promotional materials that unlawfully
13 incorporate Plaintiff’s Registered Marks is attached hereto as **Exhibit S**. Plaintiffs
14 did not authorize, and would never authorize, Defendant to use the Registered Marks,
15 or any colorable imitations of the Registered Marks.

16 26. Upon information and belief, although Defendant’s delivery vehicles are
17 food facilities and/or mobile food facilities as those terms are defined under the
18 California Retail Food Code (the “Food Code”), Defendant does not comply with
19 Food Code requirements.

20 27. Plaintiff would not authorize Defendant, or any other entity, to deliver
21 its food products to consumers without the necessary food handling licenses and food
22 safety procedures in place.

23 28. Defendant’s unauthorized use of the Registered Marks and the Imitation
24 Logo in its marketing and advertising materials creates a likelihood of consumer
25 confusion because actual and prospective customers are likely to believe that Plaintiff
26 has approved or licensed Defendant’s use of its marks, or that Plaintiff is somehow
27 affiliated or connected with Defendant or its services or has been authorized by
28

1 Plaintiff to deliver Plaintiff's food products. In fact, Plaintiff has not sponsored,
2 licensed, or authorized Defendant's services.

3 29. Defendant's use of Plaintiff's famous trademarks implies that Defendant
4 not only delivers In-N-Out products to its customers, but that the quality and services
5 offered by Defendant is the same as if consumers had made purchases directly from
6 Plaintiff. Upon information and belief, the quality of services offered by Defendant
7 does not at all comport with the standards that consumers expect from Plaintiff's
8 goods and services. Further, Plaintiff has no control over the time it takes Defendant
9 to deliver Plaintiff's goods to consumers, or over the temperature at which the goods
10 are kept during delivery, nor over the food handling and safety practices of
11 Defendant's delivery drivers. While Plaintiff adheres to the Food Code, on
12 information and belief, Defendant does not adhere to such regulations, including with
13 regard to compliance with required food safety and handling practices.

14 30. Plaintiff initially contacted Defendant on April 14, 2014 and requested
15 that Defendant stop using Plaintiff's trademarks on its website, or in any other
16 capacity, and refrain from delivering or offering to deliver Plaintiff's food as part of
17 its services. Plaintiff sent a follow-up letter on May 2, 2014. On October 3, 2014,
18 Defendant's CEO and Co-Founder Tony Xu responded, indicating that Defendant
19 had removed references to Plaintiff from its website.

20 31. However, on July 10, 2015, Plaintiff again sent a letter to Defendant,
21 noting that Defendant had broken its promise, and, without authority, was accepting
22 orders for and delivering Plaintiff's food, featuring In-N-Out on its website, and
23 using the Imitation Logo, wherein Plaintiff demanded that Defendant immediately
24 cease and desist the foregoing actions. Defendant did not respond to the July 10
25 letter. A follow-up letter on August 27 demanding that Defendant immediately cease
26 and desist all use of Plaintiff's trademarks and discontinue leaving DoorDash flyers
27 in In-N-Out Restaurants was likewise met with silence.

28

1 32. On September 30, 2015, counsel for Plaintiff sent a final letter to
2 Defendant demanding that Defendant immediately stop accepting orders for and
3 delivering In-N-Out food items, and to immediately cease and desist from using
4 Plaintiff's trademarks on its website, mobile application, advertisement and
5 marketing materials. Defendant failed to respond.

6 **COUNT I**

7 **FEDERAL TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT 15 U.S.C. § 1114**

8 33. Plaintiff incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 32 as though fully set forth
9 herein.

10 34. Plaintiff exclusively owns the Registered Marks, which are valid and
11 enforceable.

12 35. Plaintiff has used the Registered Marks in interstate commerce in
13 connection with the advertising and promotion of its restaurant goods and services.

14 36. Without authorization, Defendant has used and continues to use the
15 Registered Marks and the Imitation Logo in interstate commerce in connection with
16 its restaurant delivery business.

17 37. Upon information and belief, Defendant's unauthorized use of the
18 Registered Marks and the Imitation Logo has caused, and will likely continue to
19 cause, confusion, mistake, or deception in the relevant consumer market.

20 38. Upon information and belief, Defendant's unauthorized use of the
21 Registered Marks and the Imitation Logo constitute Trademark Infringement in
22 violation of 15 U.S.C. §§1114 and 1117.

23 39. Defendant has acted in bad faith and/or willfully in using the Registered
24 Marks and the Imitation Logo in connection with operation of its restaurant food
25 delivery business.

26 40. Defendant's infringing acts have caused and will continue to cause
27 Plaintiff to suffer irreparable injuries to its reputation and goodwill. Plaintiff does not
28

1 have an adequate remedy at law to recover for this harm, and is therefore entitled to
2 injunctive relief.

3 **COUNT II**

4 **FEDERAL UNFAIR COMPETITION 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (a)**

5 41. Plaintiff incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 40 as though fully set forth
6 herein.

7 42. Upon information and belief, Defendant's unauthorized use of the
8 Registered Marks in connection with its food delivery services constitutes a false
9 designation of origin, a false or misleading description of fact, and/or false or
10 misleading representation of fact, and has caused and is likely to cause confusion,
11 mistake, and/or deception as to:

- 12 a. The affiliation, connection or association of the Plaintiff's
- 13 trademarks with Defendant;
- 14 b. The origin, sponsorship or approval of Defendant's use of the
- 15 Plaintiff's trademarks; and
- 16 c. The nature, characteristics, or qualities of Defendant's services
- 17 that bear and/or rendering of services in connection with the
- 18 Plaintiff's trademarks.

19 43. The aforesaid acts constitute Federal Unfair Competition in violation of
20 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

21 **COUNT III**

22 **DILUTION 15 U.S.C. § 1125(C)**

23 44. Plaintiff incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 43 as though fully set forth
24 herein.

25 45. Plaintiff is the owner of the Registered Marks, which are famous marks
26 that are inherently distinctive.

27
28

1 46. Defendant's unauthorized use of the Registered Marks and the Imitation
2 Logo in connection with its food delivery services is likely to cause dilution by
3 blurring and/or dilution by tarnishment of Plaintiff's famous marks.

4 47. Defendant's acts have been willful and in conscious disregard of the
5 trademark rights of Plaintiff.

6 48. Defendant's acts were subsequent to the Registered Marks becoming
7 famous.

8 49. Because Defendant's unauthorized use of the Registered Marks and the
9 Imitation Logo is likely to tarnish the Plaintiff's marks, Plaintiff is entitled to
10 injunctive relief under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c) because Plaintiff has no adequate remedy
11 at law.

12 **COUNT IV**

13 **UNFAIR COMPETITION**

14 **CALIFORNIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**

15 50. Plaintiff incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 49 as though fully set forth
16 herein.

17 51. Defendant's acts, complained of above, constitute unlawful, unfair
18 and/or fraudulent business acts or practices.

19 52. Defendant's acts, complained of above, including, without limitation,
20 operating in violation of the California Retail Food Code, constitute unfair
21 competition, either directly and/or contributorily, in violation of California Business
22 and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

23 53. As a result of the foregoing acts, Plaintiff has suffered damages.

24 54. The foregoing acts of Defendant have caused Plaintiff irreparable harm,
25 and unless enjoined, will continue to cause Plaintiff irreparable harm.
26
27
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
28

COUNT V

COMMON-LAW TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT

55. Plaintiff incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 54 as though fully set forth herein.

56. The acts of Defendant, complained of above, constitute trademark infringement in violation of the common law of the State of California.

57. Upon information and belief, Defendant’s acts have been committed and are being committed with the deliberate purpose and intent of appropriating and trading on Plaintiff’s goodwill and reputation.

58. As a result of the foregoing acts of Defendant, Plaintiff has suffered damages.

59. The foregoing acts of Defendant have caused Plaintiff irreparable harm, and, unless enjoined, Defendant’s acts as alleged herein will continue to cause Plaintiff irreparable harm, loss and injury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment in its favor and against Defendant as follows:

- a. That Defendant, its agents, servants, employees, successors, assigns and attorneys and any related companies, and all persons in active concert or participation with one or more of them be permanently enjoined and restrained from unlawfully using the Registered Marks and/or any mark that is confusingly similar to Plaintiff’s registered marks;
- b. That Defendant, its agents, servants, employees, successors, assigns and attorneys and any related companies, and all persons in active concert or participation with one or more of them be permanently enjoined and restrained from its unauthorized delivery of food from Defendant’s restaurants;

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

- c. A finding that this is an exceptional case under the Lanham Act;
- d. An award of reasonable attorney fees, investigatory fees and expenses, together with pre-judgment interest thereon;
- e. An award of damages to be determined at trial, which, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117 shall be trebled; and
- f. Any such other relief that the circumstances may require and that the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: November 6, 2015

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
RICHARD H. ZAITLEN
ROBERT WALLAN
JENNIFER SEIGLE

By /s/ Richard H. Zaitlen
Richard H. Zaitlen
Attorneys for Plaintiff
In-N-Out Burgers

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

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial, as provided by Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Dated: November 6, 2015

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
RICHARD H. ZAITLEN
ROBERT WALLAN
JENNIFER SEIGLE

By /s/ Richard H. Zaitlen
Richard H. Zaitlen
Attorneys for Plaintiff
In-N-Out Burgers