

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PRESIDIO COMPONENTS, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
AMERICAN TECHNICAL CERAMICS
CORP.,
Defendant.

Case No.: 14-cv-02061-H-BGS

**JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF
PLAINTIFF**

On April 5, 2016, this action came before the Court for a jury trial with the Honorable Marilyn L. Huff presiding. (Doc. No. 297.) Plaintiff Presidio Components, Inc. appeared and was represented by Gregory Ahrens and Brett Schatz. Defendant American Technical Ceramics Corp. appeared and was represented by Peter Snell, Ronald Cahill, and Heather Repicky.

The jury issues have been tried, and on April 18, 2016, the jury rendered its unanimous verdict on the following questions:

1. Has Presidio proved by a preponderance of the evidence that ATC directly infringed any of the asserted claims of the '356 patent?
2. Has Presidio proved by a preponderance of the evidence that ATC induced infringement of any of the asserted claims of the '356 patent?

1 **The jury answered: Yes for both direct infringement and induced infringement**
2 **as to all the accused products (the 550L Capacitor, the 550S Capacitor, the 550U**
3 **Capacitor, and the 550Z Capacitor) and as to all the asserted claims (Claims 1, 3, 5,**
4 **16, 18, and 19 of the '356 patent).**

5 3. Has Presidio proved by clear and convincing evidence that ATC willfully
6 infringed any of the asserted claims of the '356 patent?

7 **The jury answered: Yes.**

8 4. What amount of lost profit damages, if any, has Presidio proved by a
9 preponderance of the evidence that it would have made but for ATC's infringement of the
10 '356 patent?

11 **The jury answered: Lost Profits: \$2,166,654.**

12 6. Has ATC proved by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '356
13 patent is indefinite?

14 **The jury answered: No.**

15 (Doc. No. 328.)

16 The Court previously on February 10, 2016 granted ATC's motion for summary
17 judgment of its affirmative defense of absolute intervening rights. (Doc. No. 234 at 28.)
18 In that order, the Court also dismissed with prejudice ATC's affirmative defense and
19 counterclaim that the '356 patent is unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. (Id. at 33.)

20 To the extent that any of the trial issues were reserved for the Court, the Court set a
21 post-trial evidentiary hearing for April 29, 2016. (Doc. No. 322.) The parties then agreed
22 to submit the issues to the Court based on written briefing without further evidence taken
23 in Court. (Doc. Nos. 334, 335.) On June 17, 2016, the Court issued a memorandum
24 decision finding in favor of Presidio and against ATC on all issues submitted to the Court,
25 including indefiniteness, equitable intervening rights, equitable estoppel, and laches.


26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 Accordingly, pursuant to the jury's and the Court's findings, the Court enters
2 judgment in favor of Plaintiff on all causes of action and awards Plaintiff \$2,166,654 in
3 damages plus costs as allowed by law subject to a motion for enhanced damages and
4 attorney's fees.

5 DATED: June 17, 2016

6 
7 MARILYN E. HUFF, District Judge
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28