

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT TACOMA

8 MG PREMIUM LTD.,

9 Plaintiff,

v.

10 VASILY KHARCHENKO, AND  
11 INDIVIDUAL, and DOES 1-20, d/b/a  
12 DAFTSEX.COM and  
13 ARTSPORN.COM,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C21-5733 BHS

ORDER

14 THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff MG Premium’s Motion for  
15 Default Judgment against Defendant Vasily Kharchenko, Dkt. 20. MG Premium seeks  
16 \$15,000 per infringement of its copyrights, or \$32,145,000.

17 MG Premium also asserts, but does not demonstrate, that third party U.S. service  
18 providers Cloudflare, Inc.; FDC Servers, Inc.; Namecheap.com; NameSilo LLC;  
19 PrivacyGuardian.org; and Multi Media LLC, “share common interests with  
20 [Kharchenko], [are] in privity with [Kharchenko], and [are] subject to the control of  
21 [Kharchenko].” *Id.* at 17. It asks the Court to enjoin these non-parties from “any  
22

1 continued assistance or participation” with Defendant Daftsex.com, Defendant  
2 Artsporn.com, and non-party Biqle.com, and “streaming actions of Defendant Vasily  
3 Kharchenko.” *Id.* at 18.

4 MG Premium argues that other districts have enjoined non-parties from providing  
5 services to defaulting defendants in similar cases. *Id.* (citing *Triangl Grp. Ltd. v.*  
6 *Jiangmen City Xinhui Dist. Lingzhi Garment Co.*, No. 16 Civ. 1498 PGG, 2017 WL  
7 2831025, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. June 22, 2017) (enjoining “any third parties, including social  
8 media platforms, . . . online marketplaces, online payment providers, including credit  
9 card companies, . . . and other online service providers . . . to cease providing such  
10 services to the Defaulting Defendants” and to transfer domain names to plaintiff)).

11 The Court is not prepared to issue a sweeping injunction against numerous non-  
12 parties based only on the conclusory, unsupported allegation that Vasily Kharchenko is in  
13 privity with them, or on the implausible claim that Kharchenko controls these entities.

14 MG Premium’s motion for a default judgment, Dkt. 20, is **DENIED without**  
15 **prejudice** to re-file, supported by evidence and analysis supporting the propriety of such  
16 a broad injunction.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated this 29th day of September, 2022.

19  
20 

21 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
22 United States District Judge