1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
6		
7		
8	COLOPLAST A/S,	
9	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C10-227 BHS
10	v.	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
11	GENERIC MEDICAL DEVICES, INC.,	PREJUDGMENT INTEREST AND ACCOUNTING
12	Defendant.	
13		
14	This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Coloplast A/S's ("Coloplast")	
15	motion for prejudgment interest and an accounting (Dkt. 218). The Court has considered	
16	the pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to the motion and the remainder of the	
17	file and hereby grants the motion for the reasons stated herein.	
18	I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY	
19	On February 8, 2010, Coloplast filed a complaint for patent infringement against	
20	Defendant Generic Medical Devices, Inc. ("GMD") alleging that GMD was indirectly	
21	infringing United States Patent No. 6,638,211 (the "211 Patent") and United States	
22	Patent No. 7,621,864 (the "'864 Patent") (collectively "Patents-in-Suit"). Dkt. 1, ¶¶ 9-17.	

1 | 2 | Jur 3 '21 | 4 | the 5 | rate 6 |

On April 17, 2012, the Court began a seven-day jury trial. On April 30, 2012, the Jury returned a verdict finding that (1) Coloplast failed to prove direct infringement of the '211 Patent, (2) Coloplast proved direct and indirect infringement of the '864 Patent, (3) the Patents-in-Suit were not invalid, (4) Coloplast was entitled to a reasonable royalty rate of \$55 per device, and (5) Coloplast proved total damages of \$159,775. Dkt. 200.

On June 7, 2012, Coloplast filed a motion for an award of prejudgment interest and an accounting. Dkt. 218. On June 18, 2012, GMD responded. Dkt. 229. On June 22, 2012, Coloplast replied. Dkt. 231

II. DISCUSSION

A. Prejudgment Interest

The general rule is that "prejudgment interest should ordinarily be awarded." *Gen. Motors Corp. v. Devex Corp.*, 461 U.S. 648, 655 (1983). In this case, GMD has failed to provide a sufficient reason not to follow the general rule. Therefore, the Court grants Coloplast's motion and awards prejudgment interest beginning on February 8, 2010.

The parties dispute the interest rate. "The ascertainment of the prejudgment interest rate is within the sound discretion of the district court." *Kaufman Co., Inc. v. Lantech, Inc.*, 926 F.2d 1136, 1144 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Coloplast requests that the Court impose the Washington statutory rate of 12%. Dkt. 218 at 3–4. GMD contends that the Court should impose the prevailing commercial rate of interest over the relevant time period because prejudgment interest is compensatory, not punitive. Dkt. 229 at 2–4. The Court agrees with GMD and imposes an interest rate of 3.25%.

1

The parties also disagree as to whether interest should be compounded annually. The Court finds that compounding is appropriate to properly compensate Coloplast.

В. Accounting

Coloplast requests that the Court order GMD to provide an accounting of infringing sales during periods not considered by the jury. Coloplast contends that, during trial, GMD only provided sales data up to December 31, 2011, and that the jury did not consider evidence of any possible sales in 2012. Dkt. 218 at 6–7. GMD argues that Coloplast did not seek an accounting in any pleading and, therefore, the Court should deny the request for such relief. The Court finds that Coloplast sufficiently plead a request for damages resulting from any infringing sales, and if infringing sales were made during 2012, Coloplast should be properly compensated. Therefore, the Court grants Coloplast's motion on this issue and GMD shall promptly provide an accounting for relevant infringing sales in 2012.

III. ORDER

Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Coloplast's motion for prejudgment interest and an accounting (Dkt. 218) is **GRANTED**. Coloplast is entitled to prejudgment interest from February 8, 2010 at a rate of 3.25% compounded annually, and GMD must promptly provide an accounting of 2012 sales.

Dated this 9th day of August, 2012.

21

22

United States District Judge