## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

THOMAS SKOLD,
Plaintiff,

v.

GALDERMA LABORATORIES, L.P., et al.,
Defendants.

## **ORDER**

AND NOW, this 29th day of August, 2017, upon consideration of Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law (ECF No. 187); Plaintiff's Response in Opposition thereto (ECF No. 190); Defendant's Reply (ECF No. 191); Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law and/or For New Trial (ECF No. 188); Defendants' Response in Opposition thereto (ECF No. 189); and Plaintiff's Reply (ECF No. 192), for the reasons set forth in the accompanying Opinion, **IT IS ORDERED** that:

- (1) Defendants' Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law (ECF No. 187) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part as follows:
  - a. Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED** insofar as the judgment should reflect a costs award only against Defendants Galderma Laboratories, L.P., Galderma S.A., and Nestlé Skin Health S.A.; and
  - b. Defendants' Motion is **DENIED** in all other respects.
- (2) Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law (ECF No. 188) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part as follows:
  - a. Plaintiff's Motion is **GRANTED** insofar as he moves for declaratory relief on his unjust enrichment claim.

- b. Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED** in all other respects.
- (3) Plaintiff's Motion for New Trial (ECF No. 188) is **DENIED**.
- (4) The Judgment entered by the Court on March 1, 2017 (ECF No. 185) is hereby **VACATED**.

BY THE COURT:
/s/Wendy Beetlestone, J.
WENDY BEETLESTONE, J.