

1 TODD M. SORRELL (BAR NO. 175143)
 tsorrell@fulbright.com
 2 SPENCER PERSSON (BAR NO. 235054)
 spersson@fulbright.com
 3 FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
 555 South Flower Street, Forty-First Floor
 4 Los Angeles, CA 90071
 Telephone: (213) 892-9200
 5 Facsimile: (213) 892-9494

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant
 TRI-STAR ELECTRONICS INTERNATIONAL, INC.

7
 8 DARREN M. FRANKLIN, Cal. Bar No. 210939
 dfranklin@sheppardmullin.com
 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
 9 333 South Hope Street, 43rd Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90071-1422
 10 Telephone: 213-620-1780
 Facsimile: 213-620-1398

11 ROBERT E. BROWNE (*pro hac vice*)
 rbrowne@ngelaw.com
 12 MIKE R. TURNER (*pro hac vice*)
 mturner@ngelaw.com
 13 NEAL, GERBER & EISENBERG LLP
 Two North LaSalle Street, Suite 1700
 14 Chicago, Illinois 60602-3801
 Telephone: 312-269-8000
 15 Facsimile: 312-269-1747

16 Attorneys for Defendant and Counter-Claimant
 17 PRECI-DIP SA

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 19 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**

20 TRI-STAR ELECTRONICS
 INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
 21
 Plaintiff,
 22
 v.
 23 PRECI-DIP DURTAL SA,
 24
 Defendant,
 25
 AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.
 26

Case No. CV 08-04226 GAF (AJWx)
**[PROPOSED] NON-FINAL
 JUDGMENT OF NON-
 INFRINGEMENT OF U.S. PATENT
 NO. 6,250,974**

1 Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant Tri-Star Electronics International, Inc. (“Tri-
2 Star”) and Defendant and Counter-Claimant Preci-Dip SA (sued as Preci-Dip
3 Durtal SA) (“Preci-Dip”), having stipulated that the electrical contact devices
4 accused by Tri-Star of infringing U.S. Patent No. 6,250,974 in this matter do not
5 infringe claims 1-3, 7, 13 and 16 of that patent as its terms have been construed by
6 this Court, and having stipulated to a Judgment by this Court granting Preci-Dip’s
7 request for a declaration of non-infringement, and good cause appearing for
8 granting the stipulation,

9 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** that Preci-
10 Dip has not infringed claims 1-3, 7, 13 and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,250,974 as
11 those claims have been construed by this Court. This is not intended to be a Final
12 Judgment in this case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), and any time to
13 appeal this judgment will not begin to run until a final judgment is entered at the
14 conclusion of this matter. Tri-Star may object to or appeal this Judgment and the
15 Court’s Order re: Claim Construction, including an appeal of the claim
16 constructions of the ‘974 Patent.

17 DATED: July 5, 2012



20 U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

21 Submitted by:

22 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

24 By /s/ Darren M. Franklin
25 **DARREN M. FRANKLIN**

26 Attorneys for Defendant and Counter-Claimant
27 **PRECI-DIP SA**

28 NGEDOCS: 1989707.3