

ERROR! MAIN DOCUMENT ONLY. LAW OFFICES OF PRINDLE, AMARO, GOETZ, HILLYARD, BARNES & REINHOLTZ LLP

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**

PATRICIA ANN LIVINGSTON, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
3M COMPANY, et al.,
Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:12-cv-01220-WGY-DTB

**JUDGMENT GRANTING DEFENDANT
EATON CORPORATION,
INDIVIDUALLY AND AS SUCCESSOR-
IN-INTEREST TO CUTLER-HAMMER,
INC.'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT**

Having read and considered all papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion for summary judgment of defendant Eaton Corporation, individually and as successor-in-interest to Cutler-Hammer, Inc. (“Eaton/Cutler-Hammer”), all admissible evidence filed in support of and in opposition to the motion, and arguments of counsel, the Court finds that:

1. There is no genuine issue of material fact that decedent Gerald Livingston (“Mr. Livingston”) was exposed to asbestos-containing products manufactured, supplied, distributed or sold by Eaton/Cutler-Hammer;

1 2. There is no admissible evidence that Mr. Livingston was exposed to
2 asbestos fibers released from any Eaton/Cutler-Hammer product in a manner that
3 constituted a “substantial factor” in causing Mr. Livingston’s disease; and

4 3. Defendant Eaton is therefore entitled to judgment as a matter of law.
5 Good cause appearing therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND
6 ADJUDGED as follows:

7 1. Defendant Eaton’s Motion for Summary Judgment is granted;

8 2. Judgment shall be entered forthwith in favor of defendant Eaton and
9 against plaintiffs Patricia Livingston, *et al.*; and

10 3. Defendant Eaton, as the prevailing party on the Complaint, shall recover
11 its costs against plaintiffs.

12 DATED: October 14, 2015

By: /s/ William G. Young
Judge William G. Young