

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

)	
)	
MAGBAG LLC,)	Case No.: 3:25-CV-01376
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Judge: Waverly D. Crenshaw, Jr.
v.)	
)	Magistrate Judge: Barbara D. Holmes
THE ENTITIES, PARTNERSHIPS, AND)	
UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS)	SEALED DOCUMENT
LISTED ON SCHEDULE A,)	
)	JURY DEMAND
Defendants.		

SEALED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff MagBag LLC is a manufacturer and seller of a popular consumer product, the Magnetic Bottle Bag, that has recently garnered widespread success.

2. Defendants – an array of entities, partnerships, and unincorporated associations – operate online storefronts offering illegal knockoffs of Plaintiff’s product, damaging Plaintiff’s reputation and diverting legitimate sales.

3. To combat Defendants’ ongoing misconduct, Plaintiff brings this action seeking injunctive relief, damages, and an immediate end to Defendants’ profiting from counterfeit goods.

II. NATURE OF THE CASE

4. Plaintiff is the owner of valuable intellectual property associated with the Magnetic Bag Company and its Magnetic Bottle Bag product, including federally registered trademarks, copyrights, and design patents.

5. Plaintiff diligently developed, promoted, and sold its Magnetic Bottle Bag, expanding its market presence through conventional retail avenues and online channels.

6. With increased visibility and commercial success, Plaintiff discovered that Defendants were advertising and selling counterfeit versions of the Magnetic Bottle Bag, bearing unauthorized reproductions of Plaintiff's registered marks, design patents, and copyrighted materials.

7. Defendants' conduct has resulted in serious consumer confusion, eroded Plaintiff's goodwill, and inflicted significant financial harm.

8. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief, damages, and other remedies, to halt the ongoing infringement, recover lost revenues, and protect unsuspecting consumers from the purchase of counterfeit goods.

III. THE PARTIES

9. Plaintiff MagBag LLC is an individual or entity engaged in the design, manufacture, and sale of consumer products, based in Oviedo, Florida.

10. Defendants are the entities, partnerships, and unincorporated associations identified in Schedule A¹, which is being filed under seal. Defendants are engaged in manufacturing, advertising, distributing, and/or selling counterfeit products bearing infringing marks, infringing designs and copyrighted materials belonging to Plaintiff.

IV. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's federal claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, and 1338, and supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state-law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

¹ Defendants are listed under the "Defendant Name" column on Schedule A. Other platforms identified on Schedule A are not named defendants in the suit at hand and are included for informational purposes only.

12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because they conduct business in this District and/or intentionally direct infringing conduct toward consumers in this District, including sales of counterfeit goods shipped into the District.

13. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C § 1391, because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred in, or were directed to, the Middle District of Tennessee.

14. In addition, Defendants specifically target consumers within this District by offering to sell, ship, and/or having sold infringing products into this forum. Many Defendants have demonstrably sold at least one infringing product into this forum.

V. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

15. Plaintiff's founder conceived of unique gym accessory products, including the Magnetic Bottle Bag, aimed at casual and fitness audiences.

16. The Magnetic Bottle Bag is a bag that uses an integrated magnetic backing to attach to magnetized surfaces, such as fitness equipment, keeping a person's belongings secure and easily accessible.

17. Plaintiff was founded in 2022 by Kyle Lozinski.

18. In late 2022, Plaintiff introduced the first version of the magnetic bottle bag product to markets and began tracking steady sales.

19. Plaintiff's founder spent considerable time refining the product's design, securing a federal design patent in 2024 for the Magnetic Bottle Bag. Plaintiff is the owner of U.S. Design Patent No. D1,087,596 (the "Patent-in-Suit") pertaining to the Magnetic Bottle Bag, which is valid and in force. A true and correct copy of the Patent-in-Suit is attached as Exhibit 1.

20. Additionally, Plaintiff owns U.S. copyright registrations for multiple copyrighted works that it has used in promoting the product, including photos used for marketing and

promotion of the product. True and correct copies of the copyright registrations are attached as Exhibit 2.

21. Plaintiff secured a federal trademark registration for “Magnetic Bag Company” in 2024. Plaintiff owns U.S. Trademark Registration No. 7,546,435 for Magnetic Bag Company, which is valid and in force. A true and correct copy of the trademark registration certificate is attached as Exhibit 3.

22. Consumer interest continued to increase, partly due to positive word-of-mouth and continued marketing efforts.

23. In 2024, Plaintiff’s product gained viral attention on TikTok and Instagram, driving a significant surge in demand.

24. As demands surged and sales continued to increase, Plaintiff learned of online sellers offering identical or near-identical counterfeits of its product.


25. Some of the online product listings for the counterfeit products use the federally registered Magnetic Bag Company mark, or a confusingly similar variant of the registered mark, to identify or describe the counterfeit product.

26. Many of the online product listings for the counterfeit products appear in Internet searches or e-commerce site searches for the registered mark, and the corresponding Defendants thereby purposefully avail themselves of the goodwill of the registered mark.

27. Some of the online product listings for the counterfeit products appear as sponsored advertisements when the registered mark is searched, and the corresponding Defendants thereby purposefully avail themselves of the goodwill of the registered mark.

28. Many of the counterfeit products appear identical or near-identical to the federally registered design patent of the genuine product. A true and correct copy of the drawing in the

design patent for the genuine product (left) and a photo of an infringing product (right) is reproduced below:



29. Plaintiff discovered these unauthorized sellers on various e-commerce platforms and marketplaces.

30. Many unauthorized listings display images that closely mimic or directly copy Plaintiff's copyrighted promotional materials.

31. Plaintiff also identified false or misleading advertisements claiming that the counterfeit goods were official or otherwise linked to Plaintiff.

32. Consumer confusion increased, as evidenced by negative complaints and direct inquiries from individuals who believed they had purchased Plaintiff's genuine Magnetic Bottle Bag product.

33. Plaintiff's investigation revealed that multiple entities, often based overseas, set up impromptu online storefronts to sell these infringing goods.

34. To date, investigators for Plaintiff have identified 654 unique stores selling counterfeit products or infringing its intellectual property rights in conjunction with the sale of products.

35. The influx of counterfeit goods has damaged Plaintiff's goodwill and undermined the genuine Magnetic Bottle Bag product's reputation for quality.

36. On information and belief, many Defendants are foreign entities with minimal United States assets that can be seized to satisfy a judgment, aside from money held in their marketplace accounts with various e-commerce platforms and other financial accounts with US-based payment processors.

37. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

COUNT I
(Trademark Infringement – 15 U.S.C. § 1114)
Against Specified Trademark Infringement Defendants on Schedule A

38. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 35 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

39. Plaintiff owns a valid and subsisting federal registration for a distinctive trademark, Magnetic Bag Company (the "Mark"), which appears on its product listings, packaging, and marketing materials.

40. Defendants, without Plaintiff's authorization, have used and continue to use in commerce a mark identical to or confusingly similar to Plaintiff's Mark in connection with the sale and/or offering for sale of counterfeit versions of Plaintiff's product.

41. Defendants' actions are likely to cause and have caused consumer confusion, and are likely to cause and have caused mistake or deception as to the source, affiliation, and/or sponsorship of Defendants' counterfeit goods.

42. Defendants have infringed Plaintiff's federally registered Mark in violation of Section 32 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C § 1114.

43. Defendants' unlawful activities have caused, and will continue to cause, irreparable harm to Plaintiff unless preliminary and permanently enjoined.

COUNT II

(Design Patent Infringement – 35 U.S.C. § 271)

Against Specified Design Patent Infringement Defendants on Schedule A

44. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

45. Plaintiff owns a validly issued and in-force design patent (the "Patent") on its Magnetic Bottle Bag product.

46. Defendants, without Plaintiff's authorization, have used and continue to use in commerce a design identical to or substantially similar to Plaintiff's Patent by making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale counterfeit versions of Plaintiff's Magnetic Bottle Bag products. Defendants' products are at least substantially similar to Plaintiff's patented design in the eye of the ordinary observer.

47. Defendants' have infringed Plaintiff's federally registered design patent in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271.

48. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' actions have caused, Plaintiff has been irreparably harmed and has suffered damages.

COUNT III

(Copyright Infringement – 17 U.S.C. § 501)

Against Specified Copyright Infringement Defendants on Schedule A

49. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

50. Plaintiff owns valid copyrights in the product's promotional images and other original content (the "Copyrighted Works"), which have been registered by the Copyright Office.

51. Defendants have reproduced, distributed, made derivative works of, and otherwise used Plaintiff's Copyrighted Works without authorization in online listing and advertisements.

52. Defendants' unauthorized use of the Copyrighted Works violated the exclusive rights granted to Plaintiff under 17 U.S.C. § 106 and constitutes infringement under 17 U.S.C. § 501.

53. Defendants' conduct has caused damages and other harm to Plaintiff, which entitles Plaintiff to injunctive relief, statutory damages, or actual damages, and other remedies.

COUNT IV
(Unfair Competition – Tennessee Common Law)
Against All Defendants on Schedule A

54. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

55. By marketing and selling counterfeit and/or knockoff versions of Plaintiff's product, Defendants have engaged in unfair competition under Tennessee common law.

56. Defendants' actions mislead consumers into believing the infringing goods originate from, or are associated with, Plaintiff, causing confusion and harm to Plaintiff's business reputation.

57. Defendants' actions were and are willful, intentional, and/or undertaken with reckless disregard for Plaintiff's rights.

58. As a direct result of Defendants' unfair competition, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer irreparable injury and monetary damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court enter judgment in its favor against all Defendants, and award relief including, but not limited to:

A. **Preliminary and Permanent Injunctions** enjoining Defendants from manufacturing, importing, advertising, or selling counterfeit or knock-off products bearing Plaintiff's marks, patents, or copyrights;

B. **An *ex parte* Temporary Restraining Order** to freeze Defendants' financial accounts and restrain further transfer of assets;

C. **An Order** requiring Defendants to disable and/or remove the counterfeit and knockoff product listings from the stores identified in Schedule A and any other listings that infringe Plaintiff's intellectual property;

D. **Statutory, Compensatory, and Treble Damages** arising out of Defendants' infringement and unfair competition, including costs, attorneys' fees, and interest where authorized by law;

E. **Equitable Monetary Relief** including an accounting of profits under the Lanham Act, the Copyright Act, and the Patent Act, and disgorgement of Defendants' unlawful gains; and

F. **Any other and further relief** that the Court deems just, proper, and equitable.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: December 22, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ G. Edward Powell III

Chanelle R. Acheson (TN BPR #30008)

W. David Bridgers (TN BPR #16603)

G. Edward Powell III (CA Bar #324530)

Waddey Acheson LLC

1030 16th Ave S, Suite 300

Nashville, TN 37212

615-839-1100

ed@waddeyacheson.com

Counsel for Plaintiff MagBag LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 22, 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing Sealed Complaint has been filed electronically with the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record.

s/ G. Edward Powell III

G. Edward Powell I