

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO. 25-CV-21134-RAR

RICHEMONT INTERNATIONAL SA,

Plaintiff,

v.

**THE INDIVIDUALS, BUSINESS ENTITIES,
AND UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS
IDENTIFIED ON SCHEDULE “A,”**

Defendants.

/

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR DEFAULT FINAL JUDGMENT

THIS CAUSE comes before the Court upon Plaintiff’s Motion for Entry of Default Final Judgment (“Motion”) [ECF No. 26]. Plaintiff Richemont International SA (“Plaintiff”) seeks entry of a default final judgment against Defendants, the Individuals, Business Entities, and Unincorporated Associations identified on Schedule “A” (“Defendants”) that operate Internet based e-commerce stores that infringe Plaintiff’s trademarks and promote and sell counterfeit goods bearing and/or using Plaintiff’s trademarks. *See generally* Mot. Plaintiff requests the Court: (1) enjoin Defendants from producing or selling goods that infringe on its trademarks; (2) cancel, or at Plaintiff’s election, transfer the Internet based e-commerce stores operating under Defendants’ seller names (“E-commerce Store Names”) at issue to Plaintiff; (3) assign all rights, title, and interest to the E-commerce Store Names to Plaintiff; (4) permanently delist or deindex the E-commerce Store Names from internet search engines; (5) permanently suspend the e-mail addresses used by Defendants; and (6) award statutory damages. *See generally id.*

A Clerk’s Default, [ECF No. 24] was entered against Defendants on April 24, 2025, after Defendants failed to respond to the Amended Complaint, [ECF No. 12], despite having been

served. *See* Proof of Service, [ECF No. 20]. The Court having considered the record and noting no opposition to the Motion, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff’s Motion, [ECF No. 26] is **GRANTED** for the reasons stated herein.

BACKGROUND¹

A. Factual Background

Plaintiff is the owner of the following trademarks, which are valid and registered on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (collectively, “Plaintiff’s Marks”):


Cartier Trademarks

Registered Trademark	Registration Number	Registration Date	Class/Goods
CARTIER	0,411,239	January 9, 1945	IC 014 - Precious-Metal Ware-namely, the following articles made, in whole or in part, of Precious Metals or Plated With the Same; Jewel Boxes, Fobs, Bracelets, Watch Bracelets And Buckles Therefore, not including Watches, Cuff Links, Brooches, Earrings, Eyeglass Cases, Cigarette Lighters, Ash Trays, Envelope Openers, Wallets, Money Clips, Perfume Bottles, Desk Sets, Handbags, Key Chains, Finger Rings.

¹ The factual background is taken from Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint [ECF No. 12], the Motion for Entry of Default Final Judgment, [ECF No. 26], and supporting evidentiary submissions.

<i>Cartier</i>	0,411,240	January 9, 1945	IC 014 - Articles of Jewelry for Personal Wear and for Precious-Metal Ware-Namely, the Following Articles Made, in Whole or in Part, of Precious Metals or Plated with the Same-- viz, Jewel Boxes, Fobs, Bracelets, Watch Bracelets and Buckles Therefor, Not Including Watches, Cuff Links, Brooches, Earrings, Eyeglass Cases, Cigarette Lighters, Ash Trays, Envelope Openers, Wallets, Money Clips, Perfume Bottles, Desk Sets, Handbags, Key Chains, Finger Rings
CARTIER	0,759,201	October 29, 1963	IC 014 - Watches and Clocks
TANK	1,006,321	March 11, 1975	IC 014 - Watches
SANTOS	1,344,284	June 25, 1985	IC 014 - Watches
BALLON BLEU	3,476,888	July 29, 2008	IC 014 - Watches, Chronometers, Clocks
<i>Cartier</i>	4,178,047	July 24, 2012	IC 014 - Jewelry and watches

IWC Schaffhausen Trademarks

Trademark	Registration Number	Registration Date	Class / Goods
IWC	1,205,403	August 17, 1982	IC 014 - Watches
PORTOFINO	1,846,680	July 26, 1994	IC 014 – Watches and parts therefore
	4,270,382	January 8, 2013	IC 014 - Watches, chronometers, clocks; straps for wristwatches, boxes of precious metal for watches and all the aforementioned goods from Switzerland

IWC	4,322,600	April 23, 2013	IC 014 - Watches, chronometers, clocks, watch bands, boxes of precious metal for watches
PORTUGIESER	4,412,785	October 8, 2013	IC 014 - Watches, chronometers, clocks, watch straps, watch bracelets, and boxes of precious metals for watches

See Decl. of Emma-Jane Tritton (“Tritton Decl.”), [ECF No. 8-1] ¶¶ 5–6. The Plaintiff’s Marks are used in connection with the manufacture and distribution of high-quality goods in the categories identified above. *See id.*

Under the direct supervision of Plaintiff’s representative, Emma-Jane Tritton, Corsearch Inc.’s reviewing representatives reviewed and visually inspected the various items bearing and/or using Plaintiff’s Marks offered for sale by Defendants via the Internet based e-commerce stores operating under the E-commerce Store Names and determined the products were non-genuine, unauthorized versions of Plaintiff’s branded products. *See id.* at ¶¶ 4, 11–13. Based on its investigation, Plaintiff alleges Defendants have advertised, promoted, offered for sale, or sold goods bearing and/or using what Plaintiff has determined to be counterfeits, infringements, reproductions, or colorable imitations of the Plaintiff’s Marks. *See id.*; *see also* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 7–13, 23. Defendants are not now, nor have they ever been, authorized or licensed to use, reproduce, or make counterfeits, reproductions, or colorable imitations of the Plaintiff’s Marks. *See* Tritton Decl. ¶¶ 11-13.

B. Procedural Background

On March 11, 2025, Plaintiff filed its Complaint, and on March 18, 2025, filed its Amended Complaint against Defendants. On March 12, 2025, Plaintiff filed its *Ex Parte* Motion for Order Authorizing Alternate Service of Process (“Motion for Alternate Service”), [ECF No. 9]. The Court entered an Order Granting the Motion for Alternate Service on March 18, 2025 [ECF No.

11]. In accordance with the March 18, 2025, Order, Plaintiff served each Defendant with a Summons and a copy of the Amended Complaint via electronic mail and website posting on March 20, 2025 or March 21, 2025. *See* Decl. of Stephen M. Gaffigan (“Gaffigan Decl.”) [ECF No. 26-3] ¶ 6; *see also* Proof of Service [ECF No. 20].

Defendants failed to file an answer or other response, and the time allowed for Defendants to respond to the Amended Complaint has since expired. *See* Gaffigan Decl. ¶¶ 7-8. To Plaintiff’s knowledge, Defendants are not infants or incompetent persons, and the Service members Civil Relief Act does not apply. *See id.* at ¶ 9. On April 24, 2025, the Clerk entered default against Defendants [ECF No. 24], for failure to plead or otherwise defend pursuant to Rule 55(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff now moves the Court for default final judgment against Defendants.

LEGAL STANDARD

A party may apply to the court for a default judgment when the defendant fails to timely respond to a pleading. FED. R. CIV. P. 55(b)(2). “A defendant, by his default, admits the plaintiff’s well-pleaded allegations of fact, is concluded on those facts by the judgment, and is barred from contesting on appeal the facts thus established.” *Eagle Hosp. Physicians, LLC v. SRG Consulting, Inc.*, 561 F.3d 1298, 1307 (11th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Nishimatsu Const. Co. v. Houston Nat’l Bank*, 515 F.2d 1200, 1206 (5th Cir. 1975)). However, conclusions of law are to be determined by the court. *See Mierzwicki v. CAB Asset Management LLC*, No. 14-CV-61998, 2014 WL 12488533, at *1 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 30, 2014). Therefore, a court may only enter a default judgment if there is a “sufficient basis to state a claim.” *Id.* (citing *Nishimatsu*, 515 F.2d at 1206).

Once a plaintiff has established a sufficient basis for liability, the Court must conduct an inquiry to determine the appropriate damages. *PetMed Express, Inc. v. MedPets.Com, Inc.*, 336 F.

Supp. 2d 1213, 1217 (S.D. Fla. 2004) (citations omitted). Although an evidentiary hearing is generally required, the Court need not conduct such a hearing “when . . . additional evidence would be truly unnecessary to a fully informed determination of damages.” *Safari Programs, Inc. v. CollectA Int’l Ltd.*, 686 F. App’x 737, 746 (11th Cir. 2017) (quoting *SEC v. Smyth*, 420 F.3d 1225, 1232 n.13 (11th Cir. 2005)). Therefore, where the record adequately supports the award of damages, an evidentiary hearing is not required. *See Smyth*, 420 F.3d at 1232 n.13; *PetMed Express*, 336 F.Supp.2d at 1217 (finding an evidentiary hearing unnecessary because plaintiff was seeking statutory damages under the Lanham Act); *Luxottica Group S.p.A. v. Casa Los Martinez Corp.*, No. 14-CV-22859, 2014 WL 4948632, at *2 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 2, 2014) (same).

ANALYSIS

A. Claims

Plaintiff seeks a default judgment for the relief sought in the Amended Complaint, asserting the following claims against Defendants: (1) trademark counterfeiting and infringement under section 32 of the Lanham Act, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1114 (“Claim 1”); (2) false designation of origin under section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) (“Claim 2”); (3) unfair competition under Florida common law (“Claim 3”); and (4) trademark infringement under Florida common law (“Claim 4”). *See* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 37-62.

1. Counterfeiting and Infringement

Section 32 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114, provides liability for trademark infringement if, without the consent of the registrant, a defendant uses “in commerce any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of a registered mark . . . which . . . is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive.” 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a). To prevail on its trademark infringement claim, a plaintiff must demonstrate “(1) that it had prior rights to the mark at issue and (2) that the defendant had adopted a mark or name that was the same, or confusingly

similar to its mark, such that consumers were likely to confuse the two.” *Planetary Motion, Inc. v. Techsplosion, Inc.*, 261 F.3d 1188, 1193 (11th Cir. 2001) (footnote and citations omitted).

2. False Designation of Origin

The test for liability for false designation of origin under 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) is the same as for a trademark counterfeiting and infringement claim—*i.e.*, whether the public is likely to be deceived or confused by the similarity of the marks at issue. *See Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc.*, 505 U.S. 763, 780 (1992) (Stevens, J., concurring in the judgment).

3. Common Law Unfair Competition

Whether a defendant’s use of a plaintiff’s trademarks created a likelihood of confusion between the plaintiff’s and the defendant’s products is also the determining factor in the analysis of unfair competition under the common law of Florida. *See Rolex Watch U.S.A., Inc. v. Forrester*, No. 83—CV-8381, 1986 WL 15668, at *3-4 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 9, 1986) (“[I]t is clear that the Court need not find ‘actual confusion[.]’ . . . The proper test is ‘likelihood of confusion[.]’”).

4. Common Law Trademark Infringement

The analysis of liability for Florida common law trademark infringement is the same as the analysis of liability for trademark infringement under section 32(a) of the Lanham Act. *See PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1217-18.

B. Liability

The well-pleaded factual allegations of Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint properly contain the elements for each of the above claims and are admitted by virtue of Defendants’ defaults. *See* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 7-13, 23-31, 38-42, 45-50, 53-55, 58-61. Moreover, the Amended Complaint’s factual allegations have been substantiated by sworn declarations and other evidence and establish Defendants’ liability for each of the claims asserted. Accordingly, default judgment pursuant to Rule 55 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is appropriately entered against Defendants.

C. Relief

Plaintiff requests an award of equitable relief and monetary damages against Defendants for trademark infringement in Claim 1. The Court analyzes Plaintiff's request for relief as to Claim 1 only, as the judgment for Claims 2, 3, and 4—false designation of origin, common law unfair competition, and common law trademark infringement—is limited to entry of the requested equitable relief for Claim 1. *See generally* Mot.

1. Injunctive Relief

Pursuant to the Lanham Act, a district court is authorized to issue an injunction “according to the principles of equity and upon such terms as the court may deem reasonable,” to prevent violations of trademark law. 15 U.S.C. § 1116(a). Indeed, “[i]njunctive relief is the remedy of choice for trademark and unfair competition cases, since there is no adequate remedy at law for the injury caused by a defendant’s continuing infringement.” *Burger King Corp. v. Agad*, 911 F. Supp. 1499, 1509-10 (S.D. Fla. 1995) (alteration in original) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin*, 846 F.2d 1175, 1180 (9th Cir. 1988)). Injunctive relief is available even in the default judgment setting, *see, e.g., PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1222-23, because Defendants’ failure to respond or otherwise appear makes it difficult for a plaintiff to prevent further infringement absent an injunction. *See Jackson v. Sturkie*, 255 F. Supp. 2d 1096, 1103 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (“[D]efendant’s lack of participation in this litigation has given the court no assurance that defendant’s infringing activity will cease. Therefore, plaintiff is entitled to permanent injunctive relief.”).

Permanent injunctive relief is appropriate where a plaintiff demonstrates: (1) it has suffered irreparable injury; (2) there is no adequate remedy at law; (3) the balance of hardship favors an equitable remedy; and (4) an issuance of an injunction is in the public’s interest. *See eBay, Inc. v.*

MercExchange, LLC., 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006). Plaintiff has carried its burden on each of the four factors.

Specifically, in trademark cases, “a sufficiently strong showing of likelihood of confusion [caused by trademark infringement] may by itself constitute a showing of . . . a substantial threat of irreparable harm.” *E. Remy Martin & Co., S.A. v. Shaw-Ross Int’l Imp., Inc.*, 756 F.2d 1525, 1530 (11th Cir. 1985) (alterations added) (footnote omitted); *see also Levi Strauss & Co. v. Sunrise Int’l Trading Inc.*, 51 F.3d 982, 986 (11th Cir. 1995) (“There is no doubt that the continued sale of thousands of pairs of counterfeit jeans would damage [the plaintiff’s] business reputation and decrease its legitimate sales.”). Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint and the submissions show that the goods produced and sold by Defendants are nearly identical to Plaintiff’s genuine products, and consumers viewing Defendants’ counterfeit goods post-sale would actually confuse them for Plaintiff’s genuine products. *See, e.g.,* Am. Compl. ¶ 24 (“The net effect of Defendants’ actions is likely to cause confusion of consumers at the time of initial interest, sale, and in the post-sale setting, who will believe all of Defendants’ goods offered for sale in or through Defendants’ e-commerce stores are genuine goods originating from, associated with, and/or approved by Plaintiff.”).

Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law so long as Defendants continue to operate the E-commerce Store Names because Plaintiff cannot control the quality of what appear to be its products in the marketplace. An award of monetary damages alone will not cure the injury to Plaintiff’s reputation and goodwill if Defendants’ infringing and counterfeiting continue. Moreover, Plaintiff faces hardship from loss of sales and its inability to control its reputation in the marketplace. By contrast, Defendants face no hardship if they are prohibited from the infringement of Plaintiff’s trademarks. Finally, the public interest supports the issuance of a

permanent injunction against Defendants to prevent consumers from being misled by Defendants' products and potentially harmed by their inferior quality. *See Chanel, Inc. v. besumart.com*, 240 F. Supp. 3d 1283, 1291 (S.D. Fla. 2016) (“[A]n injunction to enjoin infringing behavior serves the public interest in protecting consumers from such behavior.”) (citation omitted); *World Wrestling Entm’t, Inc. v. Thomas*, No. 12-CIV-21018, 2012 WL 12874190, at *8 (S.D. Fla. Apr. 11, 2012) (considering the potential for harm based on exposure to potentially hazardous counterfeit merchandise in analyzing public’s interest in an injunction).

Broad equity powers allow the Court to fashion injunctive relief necessary to stop Defendants’ infringing activities. *See, e.g., Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.*, 402 U.S. 1, 15 (1971) (“Once a right and a violation have been shown, the scope of a district court’s equitable powers to remedy past wrongs is broad, for breadth and flexibility are inherent in equitable remedies. The essence of equity jurisdiction has been the power of the Chancellor to do equity and to mould [sic] each decree to the necessities of the particular case.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)); *United States v. Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.*, 321 U.S. 707, 724 (1944) (“Equity has power to eradicate the evils of a condemned scheme by prohibition of the use of admittedly valid parts of an invalid whole.” (citations omitted)).

Defendants have created an Internet-based counterfeiting scheme in which they are profiting from their deliberate misappropriation of Plaintiff’s rights. Accordingly, the Court may fashion injunctive relief to eliminate the means by which Defendants are conducting their unlawful activities. Appropriate remedies to achieve this end include canceling or transferring the E-commerce Store Names, assigning all rights, title, and interest to the E-commerce Store Names to Plaintiff, and delisting or de-indexing the E-commerce Store Names from any Internet search

engine, and suspending the e-mail accounts used by Defendants such that these means may no longer be used as instrumentalities to further the sale of counterfeit goods.

2. *Statutory Damages*

In a case involving the use of counterfeit marks in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of goods, 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c) provides that a plaintiff may elect an award of statutory damages at any time before final judgment is rendered in the sum of not less than \$1,000.00 nor more than \$200,000.00 per counterfeit mark per type of good. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c)(1). In addition, if the Court finds Defendants' counterfeiting actions were willful, it may impose damages above the maximum limit up to \$2,000,000.00 per mark per type of good. *See id.* § 1117(c)(2).

The Court has wide discretion to determine the amount of statutory damages. *See PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1219 (citing *Cable/Home Commc'n Corp. v. Network Prods., Inc.*, 902 F.2d 829, 852 (11th Cir. 1990)). An award of statutory damages is appropriate despite a plaintiff's inability to prove actual damages caused by a defendant's infringement. *See Ford Motor Co., v. Cross*, 441 F. Supp. 2d 837, 852 (E.D. Mich. 2006); *Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Universal Tel-A-Talk, Inc.*, No. 96-CV-6961, 1998 WL 767440, at *8 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 3, 1998) (awarding statutory damages where plaintiff failed to prove actual damages or profits). The option of a statutory damages remedy in trademark counterfeiting cases is sensible given evidence of a defendant's profits in such cases is frequently almost impossible to ascertain. *See, e.g.*, S. Rep. No. 104-177, pt. V § 7, at 10 (1995) (discussing purposes of Lanham Act statutory damages); *PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1220 (statutory damages are "[e]specially appropriate in default judgment cases due to infringer nondisclosure") (citations omitted). This case is no exception.

Here, the allegations of the Amended Complaint and the evidence establish the Defendants intentionally copied one or more of the Plaintiff's Marks for the purpose of deriving the benefit of

Plaintiff's world-famous reputation. Defendants have defaulted on Plaintiff's allegations of willfulness. *See* Am. Compl. ¶ 30; *see also Arista Records, Inc. v. Beker Enters., Inc.*, 298 F. Supp. 2d 1310, 1313 (S.D. Fla. 2003) (finding a court may infer willfulness from the defendants' default) (citations omitted); *PetMed Express, Inc.*, 336 F. Supp. 2d at 1217 (stating that upon default, well-pleaded allegations are taken as true). As such, the Lanham Act permits the Court to award up to \$2,000,000.00 per infringing mark on each type of good as statutory damages to ensure Defendants do not continue their intentional and willful counterfeiting activities.

The only available evidence demonstrates that each Defendant promoted, distributed, advertised, offered for sale, and/or sold at least one (1) type of good bearing marks which are counterfeits of at least, two (2) of the Plaintiff's Marks protected by federal trademark registrations. *See* Am. Compl. ¶¶ 14, 23-25, 38-39; Tritton Decl. ¶¶ 11-13; *see also* Declaration of Emma-Jane Tritton in Support of Plaintiff's Motion ("Tritton Decl. in Support of Motion"), [ECF No. 26-1] ¶ 5; Ex. 1 to Tritton Decl. in Support of Motion, [ECF No. 26-2]. Based on the above considerations, Plaintiff has asked the Court to award statutory damages in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 per mark, per type of good. *See* Mot. at 16. As each Defendant used at least one counterfeit mark on one type of good, Plaintiff requests a statutory damage award in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 against each Defendant. *See id.* The award should be sufficient to deter Defendants and others from continuing to counterfeit or otherwise infringe Plaintiff's trademarks, compensate Plaintiff, and punish Defendants, all stated goals of 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c). The Court finds that this award of statutory damages falls within the permissible range under 15 U.S.C. § 1117(c) and is just. *See Yeti Coolers, LLC v. Individuals, Bus. Entities, & Unincorporated Ass'ns*, No. 24-24499 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 26, 2025), ECF No. 39 (awarding the plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each of the defendants based on at least one mark counterfeited and one type of good); *Chanel, Inc. v. Individuals, Bus. Entities, &*

Unincorporated Ass'ns, No. 23-62201 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 5, 2024), ECF No. 34 (awarding the plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each of the defendants based on at least one mark counterfeited and one type of good); *Richemont Int'l Sa v. Cartierclone.Com*, No. 23-60536 (S.D. Fla. April 26, 2023), ECF No. 29 (awarding plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each defendant); *Tiffany NJ LLC v. Individuals*, No. 22-62299 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 3, 2023), ECF No. 34 (awarding plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each defendant); *Specialized Bicycle Components v. Individuals*, No. 21-61893 (S.D. Fla. Nov. 12, 2021), ECF No. 35 (awarding plaintiff \$1,000,000.00 against each defendant).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff is entitled to the entry of default final judgment. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff's Motion [ECF No. 26] is **GRANTED**. Default final judgment and a permanent injunction shall be entered by separate order.

DONE AND ORDERED in Miami, Florida, this ___ day of _____, 2025.

RODOLFO A. RUIZ II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SCHEDULE "A"
DEFENDANTS BY NUMBER, E-COMMERCE STORE NAME,
AND E-MAIL ADDRESSES

Defendant Number	Defendant / E-commerce Store Name	E-Mail Addresses
1	allswisswatchs.com	watchesc@outlook.com 2010watches@gmail.com
1	allwatchesen.com	2010watches@gmail.com
1	bestwatchss.com	watchesc@outlook.com
1	swissrepicass.com	2010watches@gmail.com
1	swisswatchesale.com	2010watches@gmail.com
2	any-replica-watches.com	anyreplicawatches@gmail.com Chrisanyreplicawatches@gmail.com Order@any-replica-watches.com
2	arwwatchpro.com	anyreplicawatches@gmail.com Chrisanyreplicawatches@gmail.com
3	bestcartierrep.com	bestcartierrep@gmail.com hello@unitedluxuryshop.com
4	bestfakejewelry.com	bestfakejewelry@gmail.com
4	luxuryjewelrywarehouse.com	replicajewelry98@gmail.com
5	buywatchesindubai.com	watchesindubai@gmail.com
5	replicawatchesinuae.com	watchesindubai@gmail.com
5	superclonewatchesdubai.com	watchesindubai@gmail.com
6	chreplica.is	chstore269@gmail.com
6	clean-factory.is	chstore269@gmail.com
7	clonewatch.is	contact@clonewatch.io
8	dubai-watchesuae.com	contact@dubai-watchesuae.com PW-F8E41551A887EB740C2AEE9048841C7B@PRI VACYGUARDIAN.ORG
9	hagobuy.ru	
10	geektime.watch	geektimewatch@outlook.com
11	getwatches.ru	kerytony88@gmail.com
12	giftwatchesboutique.in	Sales@giftwatchesboutique.in
13	goldluxurys.com	watchgood@gmail.com info@goldluxurys.com
14	hellorolex.watch	sales@HelloRolex.com hellorolex@gmail.com hellook_sally@hotmail.com yuansunet@gmail.com

15	hontwatch-replica.si	oskarjohnatan54@gmail.com
16	hotwatchsreplica.com	salesreplicas@gmail.com
16	replicawatchshop.cc	salesreplicas@gmail.com
17	intime06.co	
18	iwatchclone.co	watchesppaservice@gmail.com
19	luxe-us.com	support@luxe-us.com
20	myswissclones.com	swisseta43@gmail.com
20	super-clones.com	swisseta43@gmail.com SUPER-CLONES.COM@WIX- DOMAINS.COM
20	swissauth.com	info@swissclones.com swisseta43@gmail.com SWISSAUTH.COM@WIX-DOMAINS.COM
20	swissclones.com	swisseta43@wixsiteautomations.com info@swissclones.com swisseta43@gmail.com
21	perfectrepwatches.com	info@perfectrepwatches.com 607D412D4ED1B7B05F30C43340E21AF2- 38626461@CONTACT.GANDI.NET
22	relojesreplicastarlujos.com	luxurys.club1@gmail.com relojesstarlujos@gmail.com 2508030trabajosstarlujos@gmail.com
23	replicaorologi.co	noobfactory@protonmail.ch
24	replicawatchescheap.com	Watchonlinestore1988@gmail.com carloasmatrix@gmail.com
24	reptime.us	watchonlinestore1988@gmail.com VATIFENS9@GMAIL.COM
25	replicawatchesusa.com	ReplicaWatches333@hotmail.com info@Royalwatchespakistan.com.pk info@Bob-Watches.com
25	royal-watches-pakistan.com.pk	info@Royalwatchespakistan.com.pk
25	Royalwatchespakistan.com.pk	
25	timezone.com.pk	info@TimeZone.com.pk
26	replicawatchtr.com	
27	rolexreplica.design	orders@rolexreplica.design
28	ukwatches.io	
28	ukshop.io	
29	watchcopiesale.co	popreplicaservice@gmail.com

30	18kcoraljewelry.com	coralperfect@gmail.com PW- 566B00F8A6987DB564DC9152F80FADC9@PR IVACYGUARDIAN.ORG
----	---------------------	---