

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

JS-6

NAVARO MEDICAL SOLUTIONS,
INC. and RICHARD NAVARO,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GLENOAKS BILLING, INC., DR.
DWIGHT HISCOX, MICHAEL
ELLIS and BETH ELLIS,

Defendants.

Case No. CV10-07668-JAK (RZx)

JUDGMENT

Date: April 2, 2012
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Place: Department 750
Judge: Hon. John A. Kronstadt

GLENOAKS BILLING, INC.,
MICHAEL ELLIS and BETH ELLIS,

Counterclaimants,

vs.

NAVARO MEDICAL SOLUTIONS,
INC. and RICHARD NAVARO,

Counterdefendants.

DR. DWIGHT HISCOX

Counterclaimant,

vs.

NAVARO MEDICAL SOLUTIONS,
INC. and RICHARD NAVARO,

Counterdefendants.

Pursuant to the Court's April 2, 2012 Order granting in part Defendant Dwight Hiscox's motion for attorneys' fees, the parties submit the following proposed judgment:

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT:

1. Pursuant to the Court's September 15, 2011 Order granting Hiscox's motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 66), judgment is hereby entered in favor of Hiscox on all the claims asserted by Plaintiffs Richard Navaro and Navaro Medical Solutions, Inc. against Defendant Dwight Hiscox. Plaintiffs shall take nothing in their claims against Hiscox.

2. Pursuant to the January 9, 2012 Order of the Court (Docket No. 96), Defendant Hiscox's counterclaims against Plaintiffs Richard Navaro and Navaro Medical Solutions, Inc. are dismissed without prejudice and without conditions.


3. Pursuant to a confidential settlement agreement between Defendants Glenoaks Billing, Inc., Michael Ellis and Beth Ellis, on the one hand, and Plaintiffs Richard Navaro and Navaro Medical Solutions, Inc., on the other hand, the claims and counterclaims between these parties have been dismissed with prejudice.

4. Pursuant to the Court's Order of April 2, 2012 regarding Hiscox's motion for attorneys' fees under the Copyright Act, Plaintiffs are to pay Hiscox \$10,000 in attorneys' fees by May 1, 2012.

5. The Court has not ruled on Defendant Hiscox's request to be identified as the prevailing party for purposes of filing a motion for costs. The Court encouraged the parties to further discuss settlement and file any motions for costs if those talks are not successful.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 17, 2012

By: 

Hon. John A. Kronstadt
United States District Court Judge

1 Submitted by:
2 A. Eric Bjorgum, State Bar No. 198392
3 Marc Karish, State Bar No. 205440
4 KARISH & BJORGUM, PC
5 238 E. Union St., Suite A
6 Pasadena, CA 91101
7 Telephone: 213.785.8070
8 Facsimile: 213.995.5010
9 Email:eric.bjorgum@kb-ip.com
10 Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant DWIGHT HISCOX, M.D.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28