

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

T-MOBILE USA, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C14-1351-RAJ

ORDER


THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendant Huawei Device USA, Inc.'s ("Huawei USA") Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law. Dkt. # 469. The Court finds that no response from Plaintiff T-Mobile USA, Inc. ("T-Mobile") is necessary for the purpose of resolving Huawei USA's motion.

Rule 50(a) provides, "[i]f a party has been fully heard on an issue during a jury trial and the court finds that a reasonable jury would not have a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for the party on that issue, the court may: (A) resolve the issue against the party; and (B) grant a motion for judgment as a matter of law against the party on a claim or defense that, under the controlling law, can be maintained or defeated only with a favorable finding on that issue." Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(a)(1). In applying Rule 50(a), the Court "must view the evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party . . . and draw all reasonable inferences in that party's favor." *Ostad v. Oregon Health Scis. Univ.*, 327 F.3d 876, 881 (9th Cir. 2003). "A motion for a judgment as a matter of law is

1 properly granted only if no reasonable juror could find in the non-moving party's favor."  
2 *El-Hakem v. BJY Inc.*, 415 F.3d 1068, 1072 (9th Cir. 2005).

3 As the non-moving party, T-Mobile is entitled to all reasonable inferences and for  
4 the Court to view the evidence in the light most favorable to it. Applying this standard,  
5 and having reviewed Huawei USA's motion and the applicable law, and being familiar  
6 with the relevant portions of the trial record, the Court concludes that a reasonable jury  
7 would have a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for T-Mobile on the issues that  
8 Huawei USA raises in its motion. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Huawei USA's  
9 motion. Dkt. # 469.

10 DATED this 14th day of May, 2017.

11   
12 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
13 United States District Judge