

JS-6

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  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

MAXIMUM AVAILABILITY  
LIMITED, a New Zealand limited li-  
ability company

Plaintiff,

v.

VISION SOLUTIONS, INC., a Dela-  
ware corporation, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 10-1488-GW(RZx)

**FINAL JUDGMENT AND CONSENT  
INJUNCTION**

**WHEREAS**, on May 20, 2010, this Court entered its Order Re Preliminary Injunction as Docket No. 72 (the "Injunction");

**WHEREAS**, on May 13, 2013, this Court granted the motions for partial summary judgment filed by Defendants Vision Solutions, Inc., Eva Succi, and Sirius Computer Solutions, Inc. (collectively "Defendants") and dismissed the first claim for relief for false advertising in violation of the Lanham Act and the fourth claim for relief for trade libel asserted in Plaintiff Maximum Availability Limited's Fourth Amended Complaint; and

**WHEREAS**, Plaintiff Maximum Availability Limited voluntarily dismissed

1 without prejudice the second and third claims for relief asserted in the Fourth  
2 Amended Complaint, namely for violations of California's Unfair Competition  
3 Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* and California's False Advertising  
4 Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, *et seq.*, conditioned upon the Injunction in  
5 this action remaining in place pending appeal,

7 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that:

8 1. Plaintiff Maximum Availability Limited take nothing on its first claim  
9 for relief for false advertising in violation of the Lanham Act and its fourth claim  
10 for relief for trade libel; and that judgment be entered in favor of Defendants on  
11 those claims;

12 2. Plaintiff's claims for violations of California's Unfair Competition  
13 Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, *et seq.*, and for violations of California's  
14 False Advertising Law, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500 are dismissed, without  
15 prejudice; and

16 3. By consent of the parties, the Order Re Preliminary Injunction entered  
17 by the Court on May 20, 2010 [Dkt. # 72] remains in effect during the period after  
18 this judgment is entered, and until the time for appeal has expired, or, if an appeal  
19 is taken, until jurisdiction is returned to the District Court, with no admission of  
20 liability by the Defendants.

21  
22 Dated: December 19, 2013.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. George H. Wu  
United States District Judge