) 1	
) 1	
) 1	
) 1	
) 1	
1	
3)	
5)	
s.Justia	.com
	3)

1 WHEREAS Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant Optrics Inc., ("Optrics"), Defendant and 2 Counterclaim-Plaintiff Barracuda Networks, Inc. ("Barracuda"), and Counterclaim-Defendants 3 891014 ALBERTA LTD., Optrics (A Partnership), Matrix Capital Corp., Zintrics Inc., Sturby 4 Technical Services Inc., Umberland Bay Consulting Inc., 1183470 ALBERTA LTD., 1183464 5 ALBERTA LTD., and 1183459 ALBERTA LTD (collectively, the "Parties") have entered into a 6 Settlement Agreement that is a full and final settlement of all of the Parties' claims and 7 counterclaims in the above-captioned action; 8 Whereas this Court awarded Barracuda \$202,035.00 in fees and costs jointly and severally 9 against Optrics and Optrics' Former Counsel, Herbert L. Terreri ("Terreri") and Grace R. 10 Neibaron ("Neibaron") (the "Sanction Award," ECF Nos. 363 and 376); 11 Whereas Barracuda has reached a separate agreement with Optrics' Former Counsel 12 regarding the Sanctions Award; 13 Whereas, in order to ensure Optrics' Former Counsel's compliance with the separate 14 agreement, as a condition of dismissal, Barracuda requests that the Court continue to retain 15 jurisdiction over Optrics' Former Counsel; 16 THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the Parties, acting through

counsel, that the above-captioned action should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Federal
Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(ii). The Parties further stipulate that the Parties consent to
Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler's retaining jurisdiction to enforce the Parties' settlement of the
case. The Parties also stipulate that each Party shall bear its own attorneys' fees and costs, except
as set forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Parties further stipulate to this Court's continuing
retention of jurisdiction over Optrics' Former Counsel for purposes of enforcement of the
Sanctions Award.

- 24
- 25
- 26 ///

///

///

///

- 27
- 28

STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL AND [PROPOSED] ORDER; CASE NO. 17-CV-04977-RS-TSH

	Case 3:17-cv-04977-RS	Document 383	Filed 08/12/21 Page 3 of 5
1			Respectfully submitted,
2			KAO LLP
3	Dated: August 12, 2021	By:	/s/ Andrew Hamill
4	Dated. August 12, 2021	Dy.	Chris Kao
5			Andrew Hamill
6			Attorneys for Plaintiff, OPTRICS INC.
7			DIMON D.C.
8			RIMON, P.C.
9	Dated: August 12, 2021	By:	/s/ Karineh Khachatourian
10			Karineh Khachatourian Nikolaus A. Woloszczuk
11			Attorneys for Defendant, BARRACUDA NETWORKS, INC.
12			BARRACUDA NE I WORKS, INC.
13			
14			
15			
16			
17 18			
10			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		2	
	STIPULATION OF DISMIS	SSAL AND [PROPOS	ED] ORDER; CASE NO. 17-CV-04977-RS-TSH

	Case 3:17-cv-04977-RS Document 383 Filed 08/12/21 Page 4 of 5						
1	FILER ATTESTATION						
2	Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), the filer of this document attests that Andrew G. Hamill						
3	has concurred in its filing.						
4	Dated: August 12, 2021 RIMON, P.C.						
5	/s/ Karineh Khachatourian						
6	Karineh Khachatourian						
7 8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27 28							
20							
	3 STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL AND [PROPOSED] ORDER; CASE NO. 17-CV-04977-RS-TSH						

	Case 3	:17-cv-04977-RS Document 383 Filed 08/12/21 Page 5 of 5				
1	ORDER					
2	The Court having considered the stipulation of the Parties, and good cause appearing					
3	therefore, orders as follows:					
4	1.	The entire action, including all claims and counterclaims, is dismissed with				
5	prejudice.					
6	2.	Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler shall retain jurisdiction over this action to enforce				
7	the terms of the Settlement Agreement.					
8	3.	Each party shall bear its own costs and attorneys' fees, except as set forth in the				
9	Settlement Agreement.					
10	4.	This Court shall retain ancillary jurisdiction regarding ECF Nos. 363 and 376 (the				
11	"Sanction Award") over Optrics' Former Counsel, Herbert L. Terreri and Grace R. Neibaron, for					
12	2 the purpose of enforcement.					
13						
14	Dated: August 12, 2021 By: Rich Sector					
15		Hon. Richard Seeborg United States District Court Judge				
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
		4				
	STIF	PULATION OF DISMISSAL AND [PROPOSED] ORDER; CASE NO. 17-CV-04977-RS-TSH				