

Gabriele Goldaper
4342 Redwood Avenue, Ste.C309
Marina Del Rey, CA. 90292

E-mail: ggoldaper@verizon.net phone: 310-302-1077, fax: 310-305-8600, cell: 310-721-7054

Sampling of Expert Witness Experience *Law firms who retained me noted in parentheses.*

1. Charlotte Russe Holdings, Inc. and Charlotte Russe Merchandising, Inc. v. Versatile Entertainment, Inc., People's Liberation, Inc., and Colin Dyne, an individual.

Charlotte Russe alleges breach of contract, fraud and negligent misrepresentation. At issue are the alleged violations of a written contract entered into by both parties whereby People's Liberation would design and license their brand exclusively to Charlotte Russe.

(Hennigan, Bennett & Dorman, Marc Morris and Rod Dorman, for Defendant and Cross Complainant)

2. L C. Footwear, LLC v. L.C. Licensing, Inc. and Liz Claiborne, Inc.

On October 7, 2009 Liz Claiborne entered into an exclusive arrangement with J.C. Penny to license the Liz Claiborne marks. This effectively rescinded LC Footwear's license to market first quality footwear to the trade. LC Footwear alleges that this arrangement adversely impacted and permanently reduced LC Footwear's on-going business.

(Foiley & Lardner, LLP, Robert Weisbein for LC Footwear)

3. The Associated Press v. Shepard Fairey, Obey Giant Art and One 3 Two, Inc. d/b/a Obey Clothing.

I represented the counterclaim defendant One 3 Two (d/b/a Obey Clothing) who licensed graphics for their sportswear, from the artist Shepard Fairey. Associated Press alleged that Shepard Fairey used and licensed to Obey Clothing a photograph of Obama, which was taken by their photographer Mannie Garcia. Mr. Fairey had not paid a licensing fee to the Associated Press so he was sued for copyright infringement and damages. Obey Clothing became a counterclaim defendant in this case.

(Caldwell-Leslie & Proctor, Robyn Crowther and Jeanne Fugate for Counterclaim Defendant OBEY Clothing)

4. Fortune Fashions Industries, LLC v. Jessie James, et al

This was a case where the 2 parties of this litigation worked together and prepared a sales and merchandise presentation to Wal-Mart with no prior written agreement in existence between the 2 parties. Wal-Mart did not like the merchandise and the selling program and passed. Two years later, one of the parties went again to Wal-Mart with his own merchandise and sales program. This revised, newer and substantially different presentation was bought by Wal-Mart. The original party made claims to the royalties and income generated from the sales of the new line of garments.

(Law offices of Yanney & Smith, Joe Yanney, for defendant and cross-complainant.)

5. E&E Co. LTD. v. Divatex Home Fashions

E&E alleged copyright infringement of a bedding product fabric print and unlawful competition.

(Roper Majeski Kohn & Bentley, Lael Andara for Defendant)

6. Bryan Callan v. Christian Audigier, Inc., Nervous Tattoo, Shop on State and Does 1-10, inclusive

Bryan Callan, a Tattoo artist sued Christian Audigier, and his clothing companies, for alleged copyright infringement, unfair competition, and breach of oral contract. I was used as an apparel expert to write the rebuttal opinion document detailing the standard practices in the process of designing garments, the value of graphics and embellishments, and the their importance in creating and building the popular Christian Audigier, brand.

(Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP, Karen Vogel Weil for defendant.)

7. L.A. Printex vs. Target Corporation; Teaze of California.

This was a copyright infringement case. L.A. Printex sues to recover damages for misappropriation of their intellectual property by Target and its manufacturer–supplier Teaze, and to restrain them from engaging in such conduct in the future. I provided the attorney with the Rule 26 written expert opinion document

(Preston, Gates and Ellis, LLP, Theresa Keyes, attorneys for the Defendants)

8. Nike, Inc. v. Adidas America, Inc and Adidas-Salomon, AG

Complaint for declaration of non-infringement of trademark and declaration of non-dilution of trademark. Nike wants to continue to use striping on their garments. Adidas wants Nike to stop the use of stripes, claiming they own the trademarked stripe design

(Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges representing Nike Inc.)

9. Mattel, Inc. v. Carter Bryant

I was one of several “experts” hired for this case. Among the many issues in this copyright infringement case was Plaintiff’s claim that Carter Bryant, an on-off-on employee of Mattel, conceived the original designs for the “Bratz” dolls while an employee of Mattel. Mattel was attempting to seize ownership of the “Bratz line” from MGA, who bought the sketches from Carter Bryant.

(Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP representing MGA Entertainment)

10. Fabric Selection, Inc. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

This is a copyright infringement case. Fabric printer sues Wal Mart stores claiming they sold garments manufactured using fabric printed with Plaintiff’s copyrighted design.

(Irell & Manella LLP, Jane Shay Wald for defendant)

11. Enrique Madrigal v. Tommy Bahama R&R Holdings

This was a Class action on behalf of the nonexempt restaurant and retail store employees of Tommy Bahama alleging that Defendant violated California Labor Codes regarding payment of wages, required lunch and rest breaks, , failure to reimburse for business expenses and requiring unlawful purchases of additional clothing aka ”uniforms”.

(Schonbrun Desimone Seplow Harris Hoffman & Harrison LLP, Wilmer Harris for Plaintiffs)

12. Christian Louboutin S.A. v. Yves Saint Laurent America

Christian Louboutin, a French luxury fashion shoe designer owns a federally registered trademark for a certain color red used on the outsoles of his women’s luxury shoes. Louboutin seeks preliminary injunction to stop YSL from selling footwear bearing red soles that infringe, unfairly compete with and dilute Louboutin’s federally registered and famous Red Sole Mark.

(McCarter & English, LLP, Harley Lewin,representing Plaintiff)

13. Reality, Inc. vs. Moretts

Designer agreed to allow the Moretts to use her name as the brand label in their garments. (Licensing) Designer terminates the licensing agreement and sues the Moretts claiming the Moretts abused and used her label inappropriately and therefore, destroyed the image of her name and damaged her reputation. Designer sued for damages

(Harrington, Foxx, Dubrow and Canter. Representing the Moretts)

14. LA Printex Industries vs. Saks Inc., Bloomingdale's Inc., Dutch, LLC

This was a copyright infringement case. LA Printex, alleged that defendants created, assembled, distributed, manufactured and/or sold garments comprised of fabric printed with Plaintiff's copyrighted design.

(McPherson & Associates, Pierre Pine, for Defendants)

15. Sweet People Apparel, MEK Denim and True Religion v. Fame Stores.

Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief and damages for acts of alleged copyright infringement, trademark counterfeiting, trademark infringement, trade dress infringement and trademark dilution and unfair competition

(The Ingber Law Firm, Mark Ingber, for Defendant)

16. Jason Theis v. Abercrombie & Fitch

Plaintiff purchased pants at an Abercrombie & Fitch store. When putting on the pants and sitting down suffered severe injuries from a needle which was apparently still left in the seam of the pants. For this personal injury case I was called in as a "garment expert" to testify about the manufacturing process and quality control in the production of men's pants.

(Law Offices of Gary Dordick, representing Jason Theis)

17. J.S. Haute Stuff, L.L.C. v. Now and Zen Productions, L.L.C.

J.S. Haute Stuff alleged interference with business relations and intentional interference with contract. Haute Stuff alleged that Now and Zen made false representations to Nordstrom, and other retailers, about their products resulting in the major loss of business for Haute Stuff.

(Law office of David Dushane, David Dushane and Johnson & Johnson, Douglas Johnson for Plaintiff)

18. SPI Manufacturing Co. vs. Pacific Sunwear of California

SPI Manufacturing created and provided garment designs and samples for Pacific Sunwear for its stores. SPI claimed Pacific Sunwear breached their implied-in-fact contracts, practiced unfair business practices and Pacific Sunwear breached confidentiality between the two parties involving designs and creative product of SPI. SPI alleged that Pacific Sunwear was using product created and provided by SPI to manufacture directly themselves.

(Dapeer, Rosenblit & Litvak, LLP, W. Litvak for Plaintiff)

19. Royal Printex, Inc. vs. Unicolors, Inc.

This was a copyright infringement case. Unicolor, alleged that K-Pak Clothing created, assembled, distributed, manufactured and/or sold garments comprised of fabric printed by Royal Printex, with defendants copyrighted design.

(Law offices of W. Patrick McPhilamy, III, Esq. representing Unicolors)

20. Donna Lee Collection vs. Trent Anderson as Trustee of the Anderson Trust.

Plaintiff, a garment manufacturing, pick and pack and finishing business, claimed to have sustained substantial damages to its machinery, equipment and clothing and goods of customers due to the landlord, Anderson Trust, failing to properly maintain the premises.

(Brdley & Gmelich, Jonathan Ross representing defendant Trent Anderson Trust)

21. Global Interactive Marketing LTD (Women' Apparel Manufacturer). Vs. United Nevada Trade International. (Factoring Company)

Manufacturer sues Factoring Company over several issues. Breach of contract: Factoring company did not advance monies as agreed. Usury charges: Factor charging "fees above the standards in the industry and above what is allowed in California". Plaintiff claimed Factoring Agreement was "unconscionable" Fraud: Intentional misrepresentation on behalf of Factor, Invasion of privacy: Factor instructed Post Office to forward all of manufacturer's business and personal mail to them. There were a total 16 different issues.

(John Fuchs of Fuchs & Associates, Inc. representing Global Interactive Marketing)

22. Simo, et al. vs. Union of Needle Trades Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE)

25 sewing operators, formerly employed by Sorrento Coats, which is has since closed due to bankruptcy, sue UNITE (apparel employees union) claiming the actions of the union were the cause for their being without work

(Andrea Cook and Linda Klibanow. Representing Simo, et al.)

23. Leonard Rabinowitz (Carole Little Clothing Co.) Vs. Levine Capital Partners.

Plaintiffs claim that they were fraudulently induced by Defendants to enter into agreements to combine their clothing company with Chorus Line, another major clothing company, which the Defendants were the primary owners, creating a new entity CL Fashions Corporation, which several months later went bankrupt. Complaint by plaintiff was for fraud, false promise, negligence, intentional misrepresentation, breach of contract and other related issues.

(Alschuler Grossman Stein & Kahan LLP representing the Defendants)

24. Cameron Industries, Inc. vs. B.I.Y.A.Y.C.D.A.

This was a copyright infringement lawsuit brought by Cameron Industries, a textile converter, against BIYAYCDA, a women's clothing manufacturer. Cameron Industries alleged B.I.Y.A.Y.C.D.A. profited from copying their print.

(Byelas & Neigher, Alan Neigher for defendant BYAYCDA)

25. Emday, Inc. vs. Kua Textiles, Inc. et al.,

Emday Fabrics claimed that a certain fabric design pattern, previously used on an Emday fabric, and owned by Emday, was used by Kua Textiles, on one of their fabrics. Emday sued for copyright infringement.

(Sheldon & Mak, William J. Brutocao. Representing Kua Textiles)

25. Prima-Tex vs. Tapestry

Fabric converter sues fabric printer over the rights and ownership of the designs used in the print.

(Berger, Kahn, Shafton, Moss, Sigler, Simon & Gladstone, Craig Aronson representing converter)

27. Keith Chung v. City of Los Angeles, et. al.

Officers representing the City of Los Angeles seized goods from Plaintiff's store alleging the goods were counterfeit. Plaintiff maintained that the items of clothing and shoes were not counterfeit and the City was not using appropriate methods to determine authenticity.

(Law offices of Gene W. Choe, Andrew Weitz for Plaintiff)

28. Polytex Thread, Inc. v Henry Tao and Far East Thread and Supply, Inc.

Polytex Thread bought the thread business from Far East Thread and Supply. Purchase included all inventory of thread. Buyer claims seller misrepresented the accuracy of the inventory. Buyer alleged fraud and deceit on the part of seller.

(James Park representing Polytex Thread, Inc.)

29. Paige Snear Apar v. Paula Speert

Two women went into business to design and market young boys clothing. After several years of being in business, Paige Apar the designer, sued her partner, Paula Speert, the business /operations manager, alleging that Ms Speert was responsible for improperly managing the business and therefore was responsible for the failure of the business.

(John Fuchs and Associates, John Fuchs representing Paige Apar)

30. Hip Hop Clothing Company Sues Bank of Los Angeles.

The Bank of Los Angeles would not agree to lend the clothing company additional monies (above their already existing loans). The clothing company sues the bank claiming they were the direct cause for the failure of the clothing company and were therefore responsible for the clothing company going out of business.

(Kramer & Kaslow. Representing Bank of Los Angeles)

31. Workers of the El Monte Sweatshop vs. Tomato.

Workers claimed that Tomato (garment manufacturer) was a responsible party in allowing the “slave-like” conditions to exist in their “El Monte Sweatshop” and therefore was responsible for financial damages and emotional suffering of the Thai workers

(Littler Mendelson and Wellman & Warren. Representing Tomato)

32. Crave Apparel, Inc. vs. Joan Blank

Designer, and one third owner, was relieved of her position by other owners of Crave Apparel. She sues the apparel company for wrongful discharge, breach of employment contract, age discrimination, breach of shareholders agreement, infliction of emotional stress and related issues. Crave Apparel files cross-complaint.

(Dapeer, Rosenblit & Litvak, William Litvak representing Crave Apparel)

33. Saks-off vs. Republic Factor

Saks-off, an out of business garment manufacturer, had been factored by Republic Factors. Several months later Saks-off started in business again. A customer from the old company wrote an order for goods to the new business but paid, the old factor. Saks-off sued Republic for payment.

(Steven Howard. Representing Saks-off)

34. Pattern Maker/Assistant Designer sues employer.

When hired, pattern maker/assistant designer, was offered and accepted, a fixed weekly salary. When she was terminated 10 months later she sued her employer for hourly overtime wages, claiming she was a non-exempt employee.

(Buchalter, Nemer, Fields & Younger, Laura Worsinger. Representing the employer.)

35. Clothing designer, Leon Max, is sued by area rug designer.

Rug designer claimed Leon Max had copied her rug designs and used those designs on his fabrics, and subsequently used the fabrics in his dress and sportswear collection.

(Gary Phillips, representing Leon Max)

36. Andrade vs. Sonerensen

One year after legal separation wife claims she has rights to husband's clothing business. At date of separation business had a negative net worth. Year later business had a large positive net worth. Husband claimed he was solely responsible for the increased value of the business.

(Trope & Trope, Steven Knowles and James Durant representing the husband)

37. ANC Apparel, Inc. Vs. Panrox International (USA)

ANC agreed to a joint venture with Panrox, a California corporation. Panrox was to produce the garments in their China facilities, ANC, in El Monte, was to market, sell and distribute the goods. Disputes arose over the ambiguity and the timely performance of the agreement.

(Michael Montgomery. Representing ANC.)

38. Williams vs. Sunset

Jill Williams, Designer, sues Sunset Inc. for breaking promises she claimed they made to her and for Sunset not having paid commissions due her. Williams understood that a verbal agreement was in place to support her claims. Other employment benefit issues were also involved.

(Michelle Reinglass. Representing Williams.)

39. Podell Industries Inc. adv. Durbin and Gowey

Two pregnant employees sue their employer for wrongful termination.

(Buchalter, Nemer, Fields & Younger, Laura Worsinger, Representing Podell Industries.)

40. Antoinette Townsend v. Magic Chef, a division of Maytag Corp., La Barca Appliances, IP Holdings, LLC dba Joe Boxer Licensing and Sears Holdings Corp. dba K-Mart Corporation

Eight-year-old girl is severely burned at the stove in her home. The area I was asked to give opinions dealt with the garment the child was wearing. At issue was whether the garment, worn by the child, who was not constructed with flame retardant fabric, was or was not pygamas or was the garment a different classification.

(McMillan & Herrell, Shelly McMillan representing the plaintiff)

41. Yaghoubi, et. Al. v. St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance

Dispute concerned the fair valuation of a men's clothing retailer whose inventory was damaged by water and smoke.

(Watson Law Group, Reid Smith, representing St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company)

42. Cali-Fame vs. Von Dutch Originals

Cali-Fame sues Von Dutch Originals for payment for hats, specifically produced by Cali-Fame for defendant, delivered to defendant, but not paid for by defendant.

(Steven M. Garber & Associates, Geoffrey Crisp, representing Cali-Fame)

43. SBW Limited vs. RC Apparel, Inc.

SBW produced T-shirts for RC Apparel. RC Apparel accepted the delivery of the T-shirts. SBW sues Defendants because they refused to make complete payment for the goods and SBW claimed that RC Apparel wrongfully resold the T-shirts to third parties without first paying for the goods

(Michael H. Kim representing SBW Limited)

44. Randi Black vs. Ce Soir Lingerie

Randi Black sues Ce Soir Lingerie for making use of her Technology, without her written consent, when manufacturing, marketing and selling their products nationally and in Los Angeles.

(Bleau, Fox & Fong, Michael Song, representing Randi Black)

45. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v. Abercrombie & Fitch

Case dealt with employment practices alleged to be unlawful. Defendants terminated employee because she refused to wear either pants or a short skirt while at work. Importance of dress code as a vehicle for image building and branding was the issue for employer and religious beliefs was the issue for employee.

(EEOC, Melvin Kennedy representing plaintiff)

46. The People of the State of California v. Enrique Sandoval, Jr. and Elisabeth Toscano

The State of California alleged that the crime of Counterfeit of Registered Mark, a Felony, was committed by Enrique Sandoval and Elisabeth Toscano.

(Brown, White & Newhouse, LLP, Katherine McBroom, for defendant)

47. Charm International, Inc. v. Ningbo Huifu Import & Export Co., LTD.

Complaint and cross-complaint dealt with dispute over a written sales representative agreement. The main issues were breach of written contract, accounting and fraud in the execution and the inducement.

(Law offices of Sun & Rosen, for defendant and cross complainant)

48. Washington Shoe Co. v. Olem Shoe Corp.

Plaintiff believes that defendant has infringed its copyright and trade dress rights and seeks legal remedies for the alleged infringement regarding women's polka dot and zebra stripe rain boots.

(Sanchelima & Associates, Jesus Sanchelima for defendant)

49. Charlotte Russe v. Travelers Property Casualty Co.

Charlotte Russe, in a cross complaint, disputes the "declination of coverage" including the refusal to provide Charlotte Russe with a defense to the Versatile Claim by their insurance carrier, Travelers Property Casualty Co.

(Abelson Herron, Michael Abelson and L.Pereira for Cross Complainant Charlotte Russe)

50 I.A. Printex Industries v. Fashion Bug, Inc.

This was a copyright infringement case. LA Printex, alleged that defendants sold garments manufactured with fabric printed with Plaintiff's copyrighted design.

(Lee & Kaufman, William Barrett, for defendants)

51. Levi Strauss & Co. v. Hudson Clothing, LLC

Levi Strauss opposed the registration of the Miscellaneous Design mark which Hudson Clothing is wanting to register with the United States Patent and Trademark office. Levi Strauss believed it would be damaged by the registration.

(McDermott Will & Emery, Rita Weeks, for Defendant)

52. Gucci America, Inc. v. Guess?, Inc.

Plaintiff Gucci alleged that Guess was manufacturing and offering for sale apparel and accessory products bearing logos and source-identifying indicia that are alleged to be studied imitations of the Gucci Trademarks.

(O'Melveny & Meyers, Robert Weelsh, for Defendant)

53. Tabitha Jean Baxter v. Wood Entertainment, Inc.; Does 1 to 20 Inclusive

Plaintiff alleged she sustained injuries on her hand while a patron on a Carnival Ride, operated by Defendant. Plaintiff claimed loss of income and impairment of present and future earning capacity. Plaintiff was in the process of becoming a fashion model prior to sustaining the injuries.

(Murchison & Cumming, Corine Zygelman, for Plaintiff)

54. Premium Denim/Sand K Cancellation Proceedings

Owner and registrant of trademark "Bette Paige" (Paige Mark) is petitioning for a cancellation of the "Paige", "Paige Premium Denim" and "Paige Premium" registrations.

(Law offices of Lewitt, Hackman, Shapiro, Marshall & Harlan, David Gurnick for petitioner)

55. Varsity Brands, Inc. Varsity Spirit Corporation and Varsity Spirit Fashions v. Star Athletica, LLC

This is a fabric design litigation, plaintiff alleging copyright infringement. Primary issues, on behalf of Defendant, were the construction of cheerleading uniforms, the use of certain functional components and the protectable and non protectable elements of the sports uniform.,

(Feldman Law Group, Steve Crosby for Defendant)