

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO. 25-cv-26168-ALTMAN

ADIDAS AG, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UJERSEY.STORE *aka* UJERSEY.CC *aka* UJERSEYONLINE *aka*
UJERSEY.SHOP *aka* U-JERSEY.STORE *aka* UJERSEY.VIP *aka*
UJERSEY2025.COM *aka* UJERSEYINC.COM *aka* UJERSEYLOGIN.COM
aka UJERSEYSHOP.COM *aka* UJERSEYUS.COM,

Defendant.

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL DEFAULT JUDGMENT

This matter comes before us on the Plaintiff's Motion for Entry of Default Final Judgment (the "Motion") [ECF No. 15]. On December 31, 2025, the Plaintiff filed its Complaint [ECF No. 1]. On February 24, 2026, the Clerk entered default against the Defendant. *See* Clerk's Entry of Default [ECF No. 13]. The Plaintiff now moves for default final judgment and asks that we "permanently enjoin Defendant from continuing to infringe any of Plaintiffs' intellectual property rights, including the adidas Marks." Mot. at 10. After careful consideration of the Motion, the record in this case, and the applicable law, we **GRANT** the Motion.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55(b)(2), the Court may enter a final default judgment against any party who has failed to respond to a complaint. But "a defendant's default does not in itself warrant the court entering a default judgment. There must be a sufficient basis in the pleadings for the judgment entered." *Nishimatsu Constr. Co., Ltd. v. Houston Nat'l Bank*, 515 F.2d 1200, 1206 (5th Cir. 1975); *see also Buchanan v. Bowman*, 820 F.2d 359, 361 (11th Cir. 1987) ("[L]iability is well-pled in the complaint and is therefore established by the entry of default.").

Our review of the record in this case confirms that the Complaint adequately establishes the requirements for the entry of a final default judgment. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, and 1367. *See* Mot. at 6. The Plaintiff has complied with our Order Authorizing Alternative Service [ECF No. 6]. *See* Summons Returned Executed [ECF No. 9]. Venue lies in this District because the Defendant “causes harm to Plaintiffs’ businesses within this district through the Internet.” Mot. at 6. And the Plaintiff sufficiently pleads claims for trademark infringement and false designation of origin under the Lanham Act; common law unfair competition; and common law trademark infringement *See* Complaint ¶¶ 38–63.

Accordingly, we hereby **ORDER and ADJUDGE** that the Plaintiff’s Motion for Entry of Final Default Judgment [ECF No. 15] is **GRANTED**. In accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58, final judgment will be entered separately.

DONE AND ORDERED in the Southern District of Florida on March 30, 2026.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Roy K. Altman', written over a horizontal line.

ROY K. ALTMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

cc: counsel of record