

- 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

L.A. PRINTEX INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
ROYAL PRINTEX, INC., PACIFIC
COAST KNITTING, INC.; and DOES 1–
100, inclusive,
Defendants.

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

///
///
///
///
///
///
///
///

1 On September 16, 2015, the Court stayed this copyright infringement
2 proceeding pending resolution of another related case between the parties in the
3 California Superior Court, County of Los Angeles. (ECF No. 23.) The parties were
4 to notify the Court within two weeks of that case's resolution. (*Id.*) That case has
5 now been resolved. (Not. of Decision, ECF No. 31.) In its decision, the state court
6 held that Defendant Royal Printex Inc. possessed an "oral, non-exclusive contract" to
7 use Plaintiff L.A. Printex Industries Inc.'s "library of designs." (Judgment 2, ECF No.
8 31.) As Defendant points out, this would seem to foreclose Plaintiff's ability to
9 recover for copyright infringement. (Not. of Decision 2.) Therefore, the Court issues
10 an **ORDER** to **SHOW CAUSE** why this case should not be dismissed as moot.
11 Plaintiff shall submit a response to the Court on or before **March 6, 2017**. Failure to
12 submit a timely response by that date will result in dismissal of this lawsuit *with*
13 *prejudice*.

14
15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 February 27, 2017

17
18 

19 **OTIS D. WRIGHT, II**
20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28