

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

2

3

4

5

6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 In the Matter of the Application of  
11 LUFTHANSA TECHNIK AG, Petitioner, for  
12 an Order Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1782 to Take  
13 Discovery, Pursuant to the Federal Rules of  
14 Civil Procedure, of Respondent PANASONIC  
AVIONICS CORPORATION, for Use in  
Foreign Proceedings, with ASTRONICS  
ADVANCED ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS  
CORP. as Intervenor.

CASE NO. C17-1453-JCC

ORDER

15 This matter comes before the Court on Astronics Advanced Electronic Systems Corp.’s  
16 (“AES”) motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 256). Such motions are generally disfavored, LCR  
17 7(h)(1), and are only appropriate where there is “manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing  
18 of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court’s] attention  
19 earlier with reasonable diligence.” *Id.* For the reasons explained herein, the Court finds manifest  
20 error and GRANTS AES’s motion.

21 In June 2021, in response to Lufthansa Technik AG’s motion to compel, (Dkt. No. 131),  
22 the Court ordered AES to produce “information on sales of peripheral parts.” (Dkt. No. 152.)  
23 Lufthansa later again moved to compel, in part, because it felt that AES improperly failed to  
24 provide it with information relating to the sales of certain equipment. (*See* Dkt. No. 188 at 9.) In  
25 response, the Court ordered AES to produce a final “[master product list] for all parts capable of  
26 use in AES’s EmPower in-seat power system(s).” (Dkt. No. 224 at 4.) Neither order specifically

ORDER  
C17-1453-JCC  
PAGE - 1

1 said that testing equipment must be included in the master parts list. (*See generally id.*) But in  
2 July 2023, the Higher Regional Court Karlsruhe issued a judgment in the German litigation  
3 underlying this matter. (*See* Dkt. No. 258-1.) There, that court made clear that “Em-Test™ test  
4 devices” were relevant in determining damages from AES’s infringing sales. (*Id.* at 8.) And  
5 based on this, AES added information on sales of “Em-Test” testing devices to its master product  
6 list. (*See, e.g.,* Dkt. No. 241 at 7.) However, Lufthansa wanted more. Specifically, it sought sales  
7 information for *all* testing equipment, not just that equipment labeled “Em-Test” testing  
8 equipment. (*Id.*)

9 In October 2023, Lufthansa again moved to compel, this time explicitly seeking the  
10 production of sales information for all testing equipment. (*See* Dkt. No. 232.) It also asked for  
11 sanctions, arguing that the Court previously ordered AES to produce this information. (*Id.*) In  
12 response, the Court ordered AES to produce sales information for *all* testing equipment, not just  
13 “Em-Test” testing equipment, and it sanctioned AES for not doing so earlier. (Dkt. No. 254 at 3.)  
14 AES now moves for reconsideration of that portion of the Court’s October ruling. (Dkt. No.  
15 256.) It argues that the Court did not specifically order it to produce sales information for all  
16 testing equipment. (*Id.* at 2.) Thus, it would be manifest error to sanction it for not doing so.  
17 (*Id.*)<sup>1</sup>

18 AES concedes the Court ordered it to produce information relating to all “peripheral  
19 parts at issue in the German proceeding.” (Dkt. No. 256 at 2 (quoting Dkt. No. 152 at 4).) But it  
20 challenges (1) whether the Court sufficiently defined “peripheral parts” for sanctions to now  
21 attach and (2) whether the German judgment referenced above puts all testing equipment at  
22 issue, since it only mentioned “Em-Test” testing equipment. (*Id.* at 2–4.) Lufthansa responds  
23 that, from its perspective, testing equipment was clearly covered by the Court’s June 2021 order  
24

---

25 <sup>1</sup> Indeed, for the Court to sanction a party for a discovery violation, the movant must  
26 show, through clear and convincing evidence, that the nonmoving party violated a specific and  
definite order. *F.T.C. v. Affordable Media*, 179 F.3d 1228, 1239 (9th Cir. 1999).

1 and, regardless, the distinction between “Em-Test” testing equipment and other testing  
2 equipment is illusory—the German judgment merely offers an example in a non-exhaustive list.  
3 (Dkt. No. 260 at 2–6.) To be clear, in the Court’s view, all testing equipment is, and always was,  
4 a peripheral part subject to Lufthansa’s production request(s). But, in retrospect, nothing in a  
5 previous order specifically and definitely explained this. (*See generally* Dkt. Nos. 152, 224.)  
6 Thus, it was manifest error for the Court to impose sanctions for not producing information  
7 related to these items earlier.

8 For the foregoing reasons, AES’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 256) is  
9 GRANTED and the portion of Docket Number 254 imposing sanctions is VACATED.

10  
11 DATED this 11th day of December 2023.

12  
13  
14 

15 John C. Coughenour  
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26