

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

Glaser Weil Fink Jacobs  
Howard Avchen & Shapiro LLP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

OPLUS TECHNOLOGIES, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEARS HOLDINGS CORPORATION;  
VIZIO, INC.,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CV12- 5707 MRP (Ex)

Hon. Judge Mariana R. Pfaelzer

**JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF VIZIO,  
INC. OF NONINFRINGEMENT OF  
U.S. PATENT NOS. 6,239,842 AND  
7,271,840 AND INVALIDITY OF  
U.S. PATENT NO. 6,239,842 (JS-6)**

Glaser Weil Fink Jacobs  
Howard Avchen & Shapiro LLP

1 Plaintiff Oplus Technologies, Ltd. (“Oplus”) brought the present action against  
2 Defendant VIZIO, Inc. (“VIZIO”) alleging infringement of U.S. Patent Nos.  
3 6,239,842 (“the ‘842 Patent”) and 7,271,840 (“the ‘840 Patent”).

4 Defendant VIZIO’s Motion for Summary Judgment of Invalidity of U.S. Patent  
5 Nos. 6,239,842 and 7,271,840 and Motion for Summary Judgment of  
6 Noninfringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,239,842 and 7,271,840 came on for hearing  
7 before this Court on September 9, 2013. After considering the moving and opposing  
8 papers and all supporting evidence, arguments of counsel, and all other matters  
9 presented to the Court, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED  
10 THAT:

11 1. Judgment is entered in favor of Defendant VIZIO and against Plaintiff  
12 Oplus, with prejudice, on each of the following grounds:

- 13 a. The ‘842 Patent is invalid as anticipated by the prior art under 35  
14 U.S.C. § 102(b).
- 15 b. The ‘842 Patent is not infringed by VIZIO directly or indirectly  
16 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b) or (c).
- 17 c. The ‘840 Patent is not infringed by VIZIO directly or indirectly  
18 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 271(a), (b) or (c).

19 2. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(1) and Local Rules  
20 54-2 and 54-3, Defendant VIZIO is entitled to recover its costs incurred in this action.

21 3. Any request by Defendant VIZIO for an award of attorneys’ fees and  
22 related nontaxable expenses under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d)(2) shall be  
23 made pursuant to Local Rule 54-10.



24 DATED: October 17, 2013

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 Hon. Mariana R. Pfaelzer  
27 United States District Judge  
28