



1 of 1 DOCUMENT

**RANGLES FILMS, LLC, a California limited liability company, Plaintiff - Appellee,
v. QUANTUM RELEASING, LLC, a Nevada limited liability company, Defendant,
and ECHO BRIDGE ENTERTAINMENT, LLC, a California limited liability
company, Defendant - Appellant.**

Nos. 11-57161; 12-55722

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 30

**December 4, 2013, Argued and Submitted, Pasadena, California
January 2, 2014, Filed**

NOTICE: PLEASE REFER TO *FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE RULE 32.1* GOVERNING THE CITATION TO UNPUBLISHED OPINIONS.

PRIOR HISTORY: [*1]

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Central District of California. D.C. No. 2:10-CV-03909-SJO-SS. S. James Otero, District Judge, Presiding.

DISPOSITION: AFFIRMED.

COUNSEL: For RANGLES FILMS, LLC, a California limited liability company (11-57161), Plaintiff - Appellee: Oren Bitan, Attorney, Lawrence B. Steinberg, Esquire, Buchalter Nemer PLC, Los Angeles, CA.

For ECHO BRIDGE ENTERTAINMENT, LLC, a California limited liability company (11-57161), Defendant - Appellant: David Aronoff, Jeffrey H. Grant, Attorney, Lathrop & Gage LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Vincent Ravine, Attorney, LAW OFFICES OF VINCE RAVINE, P.C., Lake Balboa, CA.

For RANGLES FILMS, LLC, a California limited liability company (12-55722), Plaintiff - Appellee: Oren Bitan, Attorney, Lawrence B. Steinberg, Esquire,

Buchalter Nemer PLC, Los Angeles, CA.

For ECHO BRIDGE ENTERTAINMENT, LLC, a California limited liability company (12-55722), Defendant - Appellant: David Aronoff, Jeffrey H. Grant, Attorney, Lathrop & Gage LLP, Los Angeles, CA; Vincent Ravine, Attorney, LAW OFFICES OF VINCE RAVINE, P.C., Lake Balboa, CA.

JUDGES: Before: D.W. NELSON, WARDLAW, and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

OPINION

MEMORANDUM *

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication [*2] and is not precedent except as provided by *9th Cir. R. 36-3*.

Echo Bridge Entertainment ("EBE") appeals from the entry of judgment against it after a bench trial in the district court. We have jurisdiction under *28 U.S.C. § 1291*, and we affirm.

The district court did not err when it awarded \$350,000 in actual damages to Randles Films based on

Donald Randles' un rebutted testimony that the film *Torture Room*'s market value of \$350,000 was reduced to zero because of EBE's infringement. *Frank Music Corp. v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.*, 772 F.2d 505, 512 (9th Cir. 1985).

Assuming without deciding that the district court awarded damages based on losses to Randles Films' worldwide distribution rights, the damages award was not in error. Although damages caused by foreign acts of infringement are not recoverable, the Copyright Act's extraterritoriality limitation does not bar recovery for losses that are caused entirely by domestic acts of infringement. *Subafilms, Ltd. v. MGM-Pathe Commc'ns Co.*, 24 F.3d 1088, 1091 (9th Cir. 1994) (en banc) ("infringing actions that take place entirely outside the United States are not actionable.") (emphasis added); see also *Los Angeles News Service v. Reuters TV International*, 340 F.3d 926, 931-32 (9th Cir. 2003) [*3] (discussing the territoriality limitation and its exception in terms of foreign acts of infringement). It is undisputed that EBE's infringement occurred wholly within the United States, thus Randles Films is entitled to recover

all damages caused by that infringement. See *Polar Bear Prods., Inc. v. Timex Corp.*, 384 F.3d 700, 708 (9th Cir. 2004) (reaffirming that damages analysis for copyright infringement is akin to tort principles of causation and damages."). The district court likewise did not err when it accepted testimony supporting Randles Films and rejected testimony supporting EBE in its causation analysis. *Beech Aircraft Corp. v. United States*, 51 F.3d 834, 838 (9th Cir. 1995).

Finally, EBE's challenge to the district court's attorneys' fees award is without merit. The award was not barred by 17 U.S.C. § 412 because the screenplays upon which the film *Torture Room* was based were registered at the time of infringement. Infringement of the derivative film constituted infringement of the screenplays. *Russell v. Price*, 612 F.2d 1123, 1128 (9th Cir. 1979). The district court therefore acted within its discretion when it awarded fees to Randles Films as the prevailing party. 17 U.S.C. § 505.

AFFIRMED.