

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

FORTINET, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
FORTANIX, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-06900-MMC

**ORDER RE: REMAINING CLAIMS;
DIRECTIONS TO CLERK**

United States District Court
Northern District of California


On October 17, 2022, a jury returned a verdict in favor of defendant on plaintiff's First Claim for Relief (Trademark Infringement) and Fourth Claim for Relief (California Common Law Unfair Competition).¹

The remaining claims, which are equitable in nature, namely, plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief (Statutory Unfair Competition) and Fifth Claim for Relief (Cancellation of U.S. Trademark Registration No. 5,289,135), are, like the First and Fourth Claims for Relief, dependent on a finding of infringement, and, in light thereof, defendant is entitled to judgment in its favor on those claims.

Lastly, the Clerk of Court is directed to file an Amended Judgment reflecting the above.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 20, 2022


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

¹ In that the validity of plaintiff's trademark was not disputed, the Court declined to submit to the jury plaintiff's Second Claim for Relief (False Designation of Origin) (see Transcript of Proceedings, October 12, 2022, 614:7-23, 616:7-9), thereby granting defendant's motion for judgment on said claim