1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
7		
8	G3 GENUINE GUIDE GEAR INC.,	
9	Plaintiff,	
10	v.	C15-561 TSZ
11	MARKER DEUTSCHLAND GMBH, et al.,	MINUTE ORDER
12	ot un.,	
	Defendants.	
13	Defendants.	
	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge:	direction of the Court, the Honorable
13	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge: (1) Defendants' motion for summary	y judgment, docket no. 35, is DENIED, and
13 14	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge: (1) Defendants' motion for summary plaintiff's cross-motion for partial summary ju The Court concludes, as a matter of law, that i	y judgment, docket no. 35, is DENIED, and dgment, docket no. 49, is GRANTED. ndependent Claim 1 and dependent
13 14 15	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge: (1) Defendants' motion for summary plaintiff's cross-motion for partial summary ju The Court concludes, as a matter of law, that i Claim 37 of U.S. Patent No. 8,746,728 B2 ("the French Patent No. 2,613,949, which was issue	y judgment, docket no. 35, is DENIED, and dgment, docket no. 49, is GRANTED. ndependent Claim 1 and dependent ne '728 Patent") are not anticipated by d to Raymond Durfort and Roger Brard.
13 14 15 16	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge: (1) Defendants' motion for summary plaintiff's cross-motion for partial summary ju The Court concludes, as a matter of law, that i Claim 37 of U.S. Patent No. 8,746,728 B2 ("the French Patent No. 2,613,949, which was issue The Court will enter a separate order setting for anticipation defense. With regard to whether the court will enter a separate order setting for anticipation defense.	y judgment, docket no. 35, is DENIED, and dgment, docket no. 49, is GRANTED. Independent Claim 1 and dependent ne '728 Patent") are not anticipated by d to Raymond Durfort and Roger Brard. Forth its reasoning concerning the Claim 35 of the '728 Patent is invalid on
13 14 15 16 17	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge: (1) Defendants' motion for summary plaintiff's cross-motion for partial summary just The Court concludes, as a matter of law, that it Claim 37 of U.S. Patent No. 8,746,728 B2 ("the French Patent No. 2,613,949, which was issue The Court will enter a separate order setting for anticipation defense. With regard to whether the basis of obviousness, and whether plaintiff damages on the ground of willful infringement	y judgment, docket no. 35, is DENIED, and dgment, docket no. 49, is GRANTED. Independent Claim 1 and dependent ne '728 Patent") are not anticipated by d to Raymond Durfort and Roger Brard. Forth its reasoning concerning the Claim 35 of the '728 Patent is invalid on if would be entitled to increased or treble to the Court is persuaded that genuine
13 14 15 16 17 18	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge: (1) Defendants' motion for summary plaintiff's cross-motion for partial summary ju The Court concludes, as a matter of law, that i Claim 37 of U.S. Patent No. 8,746,728 B2 ("the French Patent No. 2,613,949, which was issued The Court will enter a separate order setting for anticipation defense. With regard to whether the basis of obviousness, and whether plaintiff	y judgment, docket no. 35, is DENIED, and dgment, docket no. 49, is GRANTED. Independent Claim 1 and dependent ne '728 Patent") are not anticipated by d to Raymond Durfort and Roger Brard. Forth its reasoning concerning the Claim 35 of the '728 Patent is invalid on if would be entitled to increased or treble to the Court is persuaded that genuine
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge: (1) Defendants' motion for summary plaintiff's cross-motion for partial summary just The Court concludes, as a matter of law, that it Claim 37 of U.S. Patent No. 8,746,728 B2 ("the French Patent No. 2,613,949, which was issue The Court will enter a separate order setting for anticipation defense. With regard to whether the basis of obviousness, and whether plaintiff damages on the ground of willful infringement	y judgment, docket no. 35, is DENIED, and dgment, docket no. 49, is GRANTED. Independent Claim 1 and dependent ne '728 Patent") are not anticipated by d to Raymond Durfort and Roger Brard. Forth its reasoning concerning the Claim 35 of the '728 Patent is invalid on if would be entitled to increased or treble to the Court is persuaded that genuine
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The following Minute Order is made by Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge: (1) Defendants' motion for summary plaintiff's cross-motion for partial summary just The Court concludes, as a matter of law, that it Claim 37 of U.S. Patent No. 8,746,728 B2 ("the French Patent No. 2,613,949, which was issue The Court will enter a separate order setting for anticipation defense. With regard to whether the basis of obviousness, and whether plaintiff damages on the ground of willful infringement	y judgment, docket no. 35, is DENIED, and dgment, docket no. 49, is GRANTED. Independent Claim 1 and dependent ne '728 Patent") are not anticipated by d to Raymond Durfort and Roger Brard. For this reasoning concerning the Claim 35 of the '728 Patent is invalid on for would be entitled to increased or treble to the Court is persuaded that genuine dgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a).

MINUTE ORDER - 1

1	(2) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Minute Order to all counsel of record.
2 3	Dated this 9th day of May, 2017.
4	William M. McCool Clerk
5	s/Karen Dews
6	Deputy Clerk
7	
8	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20 21	
22	
,,	