

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

RETRACTABLE  
TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

BECTON, DICKINSON AND CO.,

*Defendant.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 2:08-CV-16-LED-RSP

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Becton, Dickinson and Company’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on the Antitrust (Counts 1 And 2) and Unfair Competition (Count 6) Claims (Dkt. No. 173, filed January 11, 2012). On March 14, 2013, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation, which recommends denying BD’s motion. (Dkt. No. 367.) BD filed its Objections on March 25, 2013 (Dkt. No. 371), to which Plaintiff responded on April 11, 2013 (Dkt. 392) and BD replied on April 22, 2013 (Dkt. 403).

The Court has reviewed the objections raised by BD and finds them to be without merit, as they raise no issues not already addressed in the R&R. Accordingly,

The Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation. BD’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on the Antitrust (Counts 1 And 2) and Unfair Competition (Count 6) Claims (Dkt. No. 173) is **DENIED** for the reasons stated therein.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 19th day of August, 2013.**



**LEONARD DAVIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**