

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AUSTIN DIVISION**

TELEBRANDS CORP.,

Plaintiff,

v.

YANGJIANG NEW SPORTS
TECHNOLOGY PRODUCTS CO.,
LTD.; SHENZHEN DEYUE
ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.;
SHAOLONG SUPPLY CHAIN
(SHENZHEN) CO., LTD.; and
SHENZHEN PUZHUO
TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:26-cv-1472-XR

**ORDER GRANTING AGREED PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
AND ANTI-SUIT INJUNCTION**

On this date, the Court considered the parties' joint motion to enter this preliminary injunction order (ECF No. 28). After careful consideration, the motion is **GRANTED**.

Having considered Plaintiff Telebrands Corp.'s ("Plaintiff's" or "Telebrands") Complaint (ECF No. 1) and Motion for *Ex Parte* Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO") and Anti-Suit Injunction ("ASI") and supporting evidence (ECF No. 2), the Court finds as follows:

1. The Complaint in this action alleges direct and indirect infringement of Telebrands' U.S. Patent No. 11,608,915 ("the '915 Patent") by Defendants Yangjiang New Sports Technology Products Co., Ltd. a/k/a Yangjiang Xinte Sports Technology Products Co., Ltd., Shenzhen Deyue Electronics Co., Ltd., Shaolong Supply Chain (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd., and Shenzhen Puzhuo Technology Co., Ltd. (collectively, "Defendants").

2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1338(a). Defendants have appeared and do not challenge personal jurisdiction.

3. Telebrands has shown, and the Court finds that, in March 2025, Defendants filed a civil complaint in the Yangjiang Intermediate People's Court, Guangdong Province, China ("China Action"), alleging unfair competition based on Telebrands' filing of complaints with Amazon against Defendants' expandable hose products for alleged violation of the '915 Patent.

4. Telebrands has shown, and the Court finds that the Defendants' theory of liability in the China Action requires the Yangjiang Intermediate People's Court to determine whether Defendants' expandable hose products infringe the '915 Patent.

5. Telebrands has shown, and the Court finds, that Telebrands, through its Chinese counsel, filed jurisdictional objections in the China Action and that the Chinese court rejected Telebrands' jurisdictional objections, which rejection was affirmed on appeal.

6. Telebrands has shown, and the Court finds, that the Yangjiang Intermediate People's Court found jurisdiction over the unfair competition claim to be proper and confirmed its intent to review and make determinations concerning U.S. patent law and the '915 Patent.

7. Telebrands has shown, and the Court finds, that Telebrands has exhausted all of its procedural remedies to persuade the Chinese courts that they should not exercise jurisdiction over issues of U.S. patent law associated with the '915 Patent.

8. On June 9, 2026, after hearing Telebrands' arguments at an *ex parte* hearing on the same date, the Court found good cause exists and entered an Order Granting *Ex Parte* Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO Order") (ECF No. 11) (1) granting Telebrands' motion for a TRO as to Defendants' activity in the China Action and (2) ordering, effective immediately, that "Defendants . . . and their officers, directors, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any other person in

active concert or participation with them, shall refrain from the following acts until further order from this Court: Making any request, claim, application, or motion further pursuing or enforcing an injunction from the Yangjiang Intermediate People's Court that would prohibit, deter, impose monetary fines on, or otherwise limit in any way Plaintiff's ability to fully and completely prosecute this action, request and enforce relief, or which would impair this Court's ability to adjudicate any and all matters in this lawsuit."

9. Telebrands has shown, and the Court found in the TRO Order, that Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in Texas.

10. Telebrands has shown, and the Court found in the TRO Order, that a ruling in the present action that Defendants have infringed the '915 Patent would likely dispose of the relevant issues in the China Action.

11. Telebrands has shown, and the Court concluded in the TRO Order, that Defendants' demand in the China Action that the Chinese court adjudicate issues of U.S. patent law would frustrate U.S. policy.

12. Telebrands has shown, and the Court concluded in the TRO Order, that Telebrands is likely to generally prevail on its request for an ASI prohibiting Defendants from pursuing any adjudication of the '915 Patent in the China Action.

13. Telebrands has argued that there is a substantial likelihood that Defendants would pursue an anti-ASI against Telebrands. The Court concluded in the TRO Order that while this argument is speculative, the consequences of such an injunction would represent a profound interference with this Court's jurisdiction over this case.

14. Telebrands has shown, and the Court concluded in the TRO Order, that there is a substantial risk of irreparable harm to Telebrands, and to the jurisdiction of this Court, because

Defendants are foreign corporations using foreign courts to seek illegitimate determinations of United States patent law.

15. Telebrands has shown, and the Court concluded in the TRO Order, that there is no adequate remedy at law to compensate Telebrands for the Chinese courts' adjudication of its patents.

16. Telebrands has shown, and the Court concluded in the TRO Order, that the threatened injury to Telebrands outweighs the possible damages Defendants face due to a temporary injunction because Defendants cannot conceivably suffer harm by being, and continuing to be, subject to the legitimate jurisdiction of this Court and by temporarily maintaining the status quo.

17. Telebrands has shown, and the Court concluded in the TRO Order, that temporarily restraining Defendants would not disserve the public interest and the TRO will serve the public interest in preserving Telebrands' duly granted U.S. patent rights and in preventing foreign courts from harming U.S. patent owners' rights through illegitimate determinations of U.S. patent law.

18. In the TRO Order, the Court considered Telebrands' Motion for *Ex Parte* TRO and ASI as also constituting its motion for an ASI and motion for continuation of the TRO.

19. Telebrands has provided, and Defendants have received, actual notice of Telebrands' Complaint, Telebrands' Motion for *Ex Parte* TRO and ASI, and the TRO Order and all papers upon which the TRO Order is based, by service in accordance with the provisions of the TRO Order and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

20. Telebrands has requested waiver of service of process of the Complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d) on June 18, 2026. Defendants have appeared and Defendants' counsel accepted

service of process on behalf of the four Defendants and waived service of process pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* Dkt. Nos. 22, 23, 24 and 25 (executed waivers of service).

21. Telebrands and Defendants have agreed to the entry of a preliminary injunction and anti-suit injunction as set forth in this Order.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED, effective immediately, that Defendants and their respective officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with them (“Enjoined Parties”), are subject to an anti-suit injunction and are preliminarily enjoined from:

- (a) Taking any further action in the China Action;
- (b) Taking any action in the Yangjiang Intermediate People’s Court or any other Chinese court which would interfere in any way with this Court’s jurisdiction to determine Telebrands’ infringement claims based on the ‘915 Patent; and
- (c) Pursuing any adjudication of the ‘915 Patent before any Chinese court, including in the China Action.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED, effective immediately, that Enjoined Parties shall refrain from making any request, claim, application, or motion further pursuing or enforcing an injunction from the Yangjiang Intermediate People’s Court that would prohibit, deter, impose monetary fines on, or otherwise limit in any way Plaintiff’s ability to fully and completely prosecute this action, request and enforce relief, or which would impair this Court’s ability to adjudicate any and all matters in this lawsuit.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that Defendants shall reimburse Telebrands for its reasonable fees and costs incurred as a result of any violation of this Order as determined by this Court upon Telebrands’ application.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c), Telebrands and Defendants stipulate, and the Court finds, that no security is necessary for this injunction because the injunction preserves the status quo and Defendants have identified no compensable harm from being restrained preliminarily from pursuing the foreign adjudication of U.S. patent-law issues.

This Order shall remain in place until entry of a final judgment in this action or further order of the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 22nd day of June 2026.



XAVIER RODRIGUEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE