

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION

TRACFONE WIRELESS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

CASE NO.: 6:06-CV-01257-ORL-18-JGG

vs.

CLINTON RIEDEMAN d/b/a LARRY'S CELL,
LAWRENCE RIEDEMAN d/b/a LARRY'S CELL,
and ROBIN KETCHAM d/b/a LARRY'S CELL,

Defendants.

**FINAL JUDGMENT AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION AGAINST
DEFENDANT CLINTON RIEDEMAN**

Plaintiff, TracFone Wireless, Inc. ("TracFone"), brought the above-captioned lawsuit against Defendant, Clinton Riedeman d/b/a Larry's Cell. ("Defendant"), asserting that Defendant was engaged in an unlawful enterprise that involves the acquisition, sale and counterfeiting of large quantities of TracFone prepaid wireless telephones ("TracFone Prepaid Phones" or "Phones") purchased from various retail outlets such as Wal-Mart, Target and Sam's Club, the solicitation and payment of others to bulk purchase TracFone Prepaid Phones for Defendant's benefit, computer hacking and erasing or otherwise disabling the prepaid software installed in the TracFone Prepaid Phones essential for consumers to access TracFone's prepaid wireless network, or reselling the Phones to others who disable the software, and ultimately sell the counterfeit Phones as new under incontestable TracFone trademarks for the unauthorized use outside of the TracFone prepaid wireless system.

TracFone asserted claims against the Defendant for circumvention of technological

measures that control access to proprietary software and trafficking in services that circumvent technological measures protecting proprietary software under 17 U.S.C. § 1201, *et. seq.* as a violation of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (“DMCA”), federal trademark infringement and unfair competition under the Trademark Act of 1946, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 1051, *et. seq.*, tortious interference with business relationships and prospective advantages business relationships between TracFone and its manufacturers, unfair competition and deceptive trade practices under § 501.204, Fla. Stat., and injury to business reputation and dilution of marks under § 495.151, Fla. Stat. On September 18, 2006, the Court entered a Default against all of the Defendants, including Defendant, Clinton Riedeman. Accordingly, it is hereby,

ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that:

1. This Court has jurisdiction over all the parties and all of the claims set forth in TracFone’s complaint.

2. The Court finds that TracFone owns all right, title, and interest in and to Incontestable United States Trademark Registration No. 2,114,692. issued November 18, 1997, for TracFone and Incontestable United States Trademark Registration No. 2,716,017, issued September 9, 2003, for TracFone (the “TracFone Trademarks”). The TracFone Trademarks are valid, incontestable, distinctive, protectable, famous, have acquired secondary meaning and are associated exclusively with TracFone.

3. The Court finds that the Defendant has violated the following statutes: 17 U.S.C. § 1201 (circumvention of technological measures that control access to proprietary software under the DMCA and trafficking in services that circumvent technological measures protecting copyrighted software), 15 U.S.C. § 1114 (trademark infringement), 15 U.S.C. § 1125 (unfair competition), §§ 501.204 and 501.211, Fla. Stat. (unfair competition, deceptive trade practices

and false advertising) and § 495.151, Fla. Stat. (injury to business reputation and dilution of trademarks). The Court further finds that Defendant's conduct, alleged in the complaint, constitutes tortious interference with TracFone's advantageous business relationship and has caused substantial harm to TracFone, and will continue to cause substantial harm to TracFone unless enjoined.

4. On November 27, 2006, the Librarian of Congress, upon the recommendation of the Register of Copyrights, issued a Final Rule setting forth six (6) classes of copyrighted works that are exempt from the provisions of the DMCA, including:

Computer programs in the form of firmware that enable wireless telephone handsets to connect to a wireless telephone communication network, when circumvention is accomplished for the sole purpose of lawfully connecting to a wireless telephone communication network.

71 Fed. Reg. 68472 (Nov. 27, 2006) (amending 37 C.F.R. § 201.40(b)). The Court finds that this new exemption does not absolve the Defendant of liability for his violations of the DMCA as alleged in Counts I through III of TracFone's complaint, because the Defendant's conduct as alleged in this case does not come within the scope of the new exemption. The Defendant's purchase and resale of the TracFone handsets was for the purpose of reselling those handsets for a profit, and not "for the sole purpose of lawfully connecting to a wireless telephone communication network." Because the exemption does not apply to the conduct alleged in this case, there is no need for the Court to address the validity of the exemption or the circumstances surrounding its enactment.

5. TracFone has suffered damages, including loss of goodwill and damage to its reputation, as a result of the Defendant's conduct. TracFone is entitled to injunctive relief and damages on the claims set forth in the complaint.

6. Final judgment is hereby entered against the Defendant. Clinton Riedeman, and in favor of the Plaintiff, TracFone Wireless, Inc., on all of the claims set forth in TracFone's complaint.

7. Defendant, Clinton Riedeman, and each and all of his representatives, agents, employees, independent contractors, relatives, associates, servants and any and all persons and entities in active concert and participation with them who receive notice of this order shall be and hereby are PERMANENTLY ENJOINED from:

- a. purchasing and/or selling any wireless mobile phone that they know or should know bears any TracFone Trademark, any other trademark owned or used by TracFone, or any other model of wireless mobile phone sold or marketed by TracFone ("TracFone Handsets"). Specifically, the Defendants are enjoined from purchasing and/or selling all models of TracFone Handsets currently offered for sale by TracFone, or that may be offered for sale in the future, as listed and updated from time to time on TracFone's website, http://tracfone.com/activation_pick_brand.jsp, including without limitation the following TracFone handsets:

Motorola W370	Nokia 2126	LG 3280
Motorola C261	Nokia 2126i	LG CG225
Motorola C139	Nokia 2600	LG 1500
Motorola V176	Nokia 1100	
Motorola V170	Nokia 1112	
Motorola V171	Nokia 1600	
Motorola C155	Nokia 2285	
Motorola C343		

- b. reflashing and/or unlocking of any TracFone Handset;

- c. accessing, altering, erasing, tampering with, deleting or otherwise disabling TracFone's proprietary prepaid cellular software contained within any and all models of TracFone Handsets;
- d. facilitating or in any way assisting other persons or entities who Defendants know or should know are engaged in reflashing and/or unlocking TracFone Handsets and/or hacking, altering, erasing, tampering with, deleting or otherwise disabling the software installed in TracFone Handsets;
- e. facilitating or in any way assisting other persons or entities who Defendants know or should know are engaged in any of the acts prohibited under this permanent injunction including, without limitation, the buying and/or selling of unlocked TracFone Handsets; and
- f. knowingly using the TracFone Trademarks or any other trademark owned or used by TracFone, or that is likely to cause confusion with TracFone's Trademarks, without TracFone's prior written authorization.

8. The last known address of Defendant Clinton Riedeman is 1722 West Acre Drive, St. Cloud, FL 34769.

9. The address of Plaintiff, TracFone Wireless, Inc., is 8390 NW 25th Street, Miami, FL 33122.

10. Defendant, Clinton Riedeman, and TracFone waive their right to appeal from the entry of this Final Judgment.


11. The Court retains jurisdiction over this matter and the parties to this action in order to punish any violation of the terms of this Permanent Injunction by a finding of contempt and a payment of damages to TracFone Wireless, Inc. in an amount of not less than \$5,000 for

each TracFone Handset that Defendant is found to have purchased, sold, or unlocked in violation of this injunction.

12. The prevailing party in any proceeding to enforce compliance with the terms of this Permanent Injunction shall be entitled to an award of its attorneys' fees and costs.

13. This case remains pending against Defendant Robin Ketcham and Defendant Lawrence Riedeman, and the Court finds that there is no just reason for delay of the entry of judgment against Defendant, Clinton Riedeman and therefore directs the Clerk to enter Judgment as set forth herein. *See Fed.R.Civ.P. 54(b).*

DONE AND ORDERED in Orlando, Florida, this 6 day of Sept, 2007.



The Honorable G. Kendall Sharp
United States District Judge

Copies furnished to:

James B. Baldinger, *Counsel for TracFone Wireless*
Jeffrey Blau, *Counsel for Defendant Robin Ketcham*
Frank Killgore, Jr. and Alyson Innes, *Counsel for Defendants Clinton Riedeman, Lawrence Riedeman and Reidcor, Inc.*