

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

9
10 PACTOOL INTERNATIONAL LTD.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 KETT TOOL COMPANY, INC., et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C06-5367BHS

ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO
VACATE PREVIOUS ORDER

15
16 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Kett Tool Company, Inc.'s
17 ("Kett") motion to vacate summary judgment of literal infringement (Dkt. 148). Dkt.
18 270. The Court has reviewed the briefs filed in support of and in opposition to the motion
19 and the remainder of the file and hereby grants the motion for the reasons stated herein.

20 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

21 On June 29, 2006, Plaintiff PacTool International LTD ("Pactool") filed a
22 complaint against Kett, alleging patent infringement. Dkt. 1. On April 8, 2010, PacTool
23 filed a First Amended Complaint ("FAC") against Defendants Kett and H. Rowe
24 Hoffman alleging patent infringement. Dkt. 63. PacTool alleges infringement of two
25 patents: U.S. Patent 5,993,303 (hereinafter "the '303 patent") and U.S. Patent No.
26 6,250,998 (hereinafter "the '998 patent"). *Id.*

1 On March 25, 2010, Pactool filed a motion for summary judgment of literal
2 infringement. Dkt. 58. On April 12, 2010, Kett responded and relied on various
3 arguments, including that the patents were unenforceable or invalid and that the devices
4 were not used to cut fiber-cement board of certain widths. Dkt. 66.

5 After numerous motions on other issues, the Court concluded that the summary
6 judgment motion could be considered prior to claim construction and noted the motion for
7 consideration on the Court's December 15, 2010 calendar. Dkt. 129. On January 31,
8 2011, the Court issued an order granting the motion in part and denying the motion in
9 part. Dkt. 148. Although Kett made the blanket assertion that PacTool "has not
10 eliminated all of the material questions of fact that is required to receive the judgment it
11 seeks," it failed to contest a significant portion of the claim limitations in the patents in
12 suit. See Dkt. 66. Moreover, PacTool supplied deposition testimony of a Kett
13 representative asserting "that, with the exception of two elements, all other elements of
14 Claims 10 and 19 of the '998 Patent are infringed by Kett's accused devices. Dkt. 59-3 at
15 91-92, 94-95." Dkt. 148 at 9. In light of the evidence and argument on record, the Court
16 granted PacTool's motion on two issues, which are as follows:
17

18 based on the evidence presented and Kett's lack of response, the Court
19 concludes that PacTool has established that Kett's accused devices,
20 depicted in Bates KETT03295 and KETT0331-32 (Dkt. 59-3 at 46, 48-49),
are representative of all Kett's fiber-cement cutting shears currently sold
(Dkts. 59-2 at 1-2, 71 at 12 & 71-2 at 2).

21 the Court concludes that PacTool is entitled to summary judgment of literal
22 infringement of Claims 10 and 19 of the '998 patent by the accused devices
23 as depicted in Bates KETT03295 and KETT0331-32 (Dkt. 59-3 at 46,
48-49).

24 Dkt. 148 at 5, 9. The Court denied PacTool's motion as to Claim 16 of the '303 patent.
25 *Id.* at 7-8.

26 On October 27, 2011, the Court issued an order construing the claims of the
27 patents in suit. Dkt. 263. The Court concluded that, although some claim limitations
28

1 were based on words of degree, the patents provided sufficient information for a person
2 of ordinary skill in the art to determine an objective standard for these limitations. *Id.* at
3 9-11.

4 On September 13, 2011, Pactool filed another motion for summary judgment of
5 literal infringement. Dkt. 243. On October 3, 2011, Kett responded and argued that
6 PacTool had failed to meet its burden as to the words of degree limitations. *See* Dkt. 249.
7 The Court agreed, and on October 28, 2011, the Court denied PacTool's motion. Dkt.
8 265.

9 On November 3, 2011, Kett filed a motion to vacate the Court's first order
10 granting summary judgment as to literal infringement on Claims 10 and 19 of the '998
11 patent. Dkt. 270. On November 14, 2011, PacTool responded. Dkt. 286. On November
12 25, 2011, Kett replied. Dkt. 291.


14 II. DISCUSSION

15 A district court retains the power to revisit prior summary judgment orders before
16 the entry of final judgment. *Exigent Technology, Inc. v. Atrana Solutions, Inc.*, 442 F.3d
17 1301, 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

18 In this case, Kett requests that the Court revisit and vacate its order granting
19 summary judgment of literal infringement because that order (Dkt. 148) is inconsistent
20 with the subsequent order denying summary judgment of literal infringement (Dkt. 265).
21 Dkt. 270 at 4-6. The Court agrees that the rulings are inconsistent, an issue that PacTool
22 did not address in its response. A finding of inconsistency, however, does not resolve the
23 issue because PacTool correctly points out and vigorously argues that Kett failed to
24 present its arguments as to the words of degree limitations on the earlier motion for
25 summary judgment. *See* Dkt. 286 at 6-9. Thus, the Court must decide whether to hold a
26 party to a previous order based on the party's failure to present arguments or whether to
27
28

1 **VACATED** as to the issue of literal infringement of Claims 10 and 19 of the '998 patent
2 (Dkt. 148), and PacTool's motion (Dkt. 58) on this issue is **DENIED**.

3 DATED this 20th day of December, 2011.

4
5 

6 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28