

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAYMAT MATERIALS, INC., a
California corporation,

No. C 13-00567 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

A&C CATALYSTS, INC., a New Jersey
corporation,

**ORDER RE RAYMAT'S MOTION
FOR AN ORDER FINDING
A&C CATALYSTS AND COUNSEL
IN CIVIL CONTEMPT**

Defendant and Third-Party
Plaintiff,

v.

PROTAMEEN CHEMICALS, INC., a
New Jersey corporation,

Third-Party Defendant.

On April 11, plaintiff Raymat Materials, Inc. filed a motion for an order finding defendant A&C Catalysts, Inc. and counsel in civil contempt, noticed for May 22 (Dkt. No. 75). Raymat argued that there “is a high likelihood that the AEO information has been shared with [A&C Catalysts].” On April 25, A&C Catalysts, Inc. filed a response and requested fees for opposing the motion (Dkt. No. 94).

On April 30, Raymat withdrew its motion and stated “all three lawyers of [A&C Catalysts] filed declarations to state that they had not disseminated the AEO information with their clients” (Dkt. No. 101).


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

On May 2, counsel for A&C Catalysts filed a declaration in support of their request for \$2,350 in attorney’s fees. The same day, Raymat filed a letter response, but did not address the fees requested. Instead, Raymat argued that this issue needs full motion practice. This order disagrees. Full motion practice will only drive up fees for both sides.

By **NOON ON MAY 6**, Raymat shall file a response to A&C Catalysts’ request for attorney’s fees. This is Raymat’s opportunity to brief the issue. Both sides should be prepared to address this issue at the hearing on May 8.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 2, 2014.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE