

## TRADEMARK ASSIGNMENT

Electronic Version v1.1  
 Stylesheet Version v1.1

SUBMISSION TYPE:	NEW ASSIGNMENT		
NATURE OF CONVEYANCE:	LIEN		
CONVEYING PARTY DATA			
Name	Formerly	Execution Date	Entity Type
Marlene Prada-Bautista		09/06/2012	INDIVIDUAL: COLOMBIA
RECEIVING PARTY DATA			
Name:	Dora Diaz		
Street Address:	5807 Pacific Boulevard		
City:	Huntington Park		
State/Country:	CALIFORNIA		
Postal Code:	90255		
Entity Type:	INDIVIDUAL: COLOMBIA		
PROPERTY NUMBERS Total: 2			
Property Type	Number	Word Mark	
Registration Number:	3709357	GIRDLE'U	
Serial Number:	77855472	FÁJATE	
CORRESPONDENCE DATA			
Fax Number:	3105571540		
<i>Correspondence will be sent to the e-mail address first; if that is unsuccessful, it will be sent via US Mail.</i>			
Phone:	310-557-1511		
Email:	mlerner@kleinbergler.com		
Correspondent Name:	Marshall A. Lerner		
Address Line 1:	1875 Century Park East, Suite 1150		
Address Line 4:	Los Angeles, CALIFORNIA 90067		
ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER:	21593		
NAME OF SUBMITTER:	Marshall A. Lerner		
Signature:	/Marshall A. Lerner/		

OP \$65.00 3709357

Date:

09/06/2012

Total Attachments: 3

source=Judgment (Diaz v. Prada et al.)#page1.tif

source=Judgment (Diaz v. Prada et al.)#page2.tif

source=Judgment (Diaz v. Prada et al.)#page3.tif

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DORA M. DIAZ, et al.

Plaintiff,

v.

MARLENE PRADA BAUTISTA, et  
al.,

Defendants.

) Case No. 2:10-cv-04690-JHN-JC

)

)

) JUDGMENT AGAINST DEFENDANT'S

) MARLENE PRADA BAUTISTA, MARIA

) RUTH CUERVO, AND NELLY

) SANTAMARIA

)

) Judge: Honorable Jacqueline H. Nguyen

)

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM

)

)

In its Special Verdict Form filed on February 4, 2012 (Docket No. 245), the jury found that:

(1) As between plaintiff Dora Diaz ("Diaz") and defendant Marlene Prada Bautista ("Prada"), Diaz was the first to use her FAJATE mark in commerce in the United States;

(2) Prada's FÁJATE mark is a counterfeit mark;

1 (3) As of February 2008, Prada had actual or statutory notice that Diaz's  
2 FAJATE mark was registered;

3 (4) As of August 2009, defendant Maria Ruth Cuervo ("Cuervo") had actual or  
4 statutory notice that Diaz's FAJATE mark was registered;

5 (5) As of August 2009, defendant Nelly Santamaria ("Santamaria") had actual  
6 or statutory notice that Diaz's FAJATE mark was registered;

7 (6) Prada, Cuervo, and Santamaria each willfully used the FAJATE trademark;  
8 and

9 (7) The amount of statutory damages awarded to Diaz (1) from Prada is  
10 \$1,000,000, (2) from Cuervo is \$50,000, and (3) from Santamaria is \$3,000.

11 Based on that Special Verdict Form (Docket No. 245) and the Court's June 29,  
12 2012 Order re: (1) Prada's Claim Under the Inter-American Convention; (2) Application  
13 of the Laches Defense; and (3) Diaz's motion for Permanent Injunction (Docket No.  
14 280), the Court **ORDERS, ADJUDGES and DECREES** as follows:

15 1. Judgment is entered in favor of Diaz and against Prada, Cuervo, and  
16 Santamaria;

17 2. An injunction shall be separately issued against Prada, Cuervo, and  
18 Santamaria;

19 3. Prada shall pay to Diaz the sum of one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00) plus  
20 interest thereon pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961;

21 4. Cuervo shall pay to Diaz the sum of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000.00) plus  
22 interest thereon pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961;

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///


28 ///

1           5.     Santamaria shall pay to Diaz the sum of three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00)  
2 plus interest thereon pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961; and

3           6.     Diaz is the prevailing party under Local Rule 54-2. Diaz shall recover costs  
4 against Prada, Cuervo, and Santamaria.

5  
6 **IT IS SO ADJUDGED, ORDERED, and DECREED.**

7  
8 Dated: August 24, 2012

9   
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 Honorable Jacqueline H. Nguyen\*

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 \_\_\_\_\_  
\* Circuit Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, sitting by designation. From June 24, 2010 to May 14, 2012, Judge Nguyen presided over this case as a United States District Judge.