

REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

Fitzpatrick, Cella, Harper & Cella:

- *Glaxo Group LTD d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline v. Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, LTD*, (S.D.N.Y.) – represented plaintiff in Hatch Waxman patent litigation pertaining to the migraine medication Imitrex®
- *Nano-Proprietary, Inc. v. Canon Inc. and Canon U.S.A., Inc.*, (W.D. Tex.) – represented defendants through jury trial resulting in a verdict awarding zero dollars in damages to plaintiff
- *Nano-Proprietary, Inc. v. Canon Inc.*, (5th Cir.) – represented appellee and succeeded in having the jury's verdict of no damages affirmed and the trial court's grant of summary judgment reversed in its entirety resulting in a complete victory on behalf of the client
- *Pfizer, Inc. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc.*, (D.N.J.) – represented plaintiff in Hatch Waxman patent litigation where we succeeded in halting sales of a generic quinapril product marketed by generic pharmaceutical manufacturers
- *Pfizer, Inc. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc.*, (Fed. Cir.) – represented appellant and persuaded the Federal Circuit to affirm the preliminary injunction granted by the D.N.J.
- *SP Technologies v. Canon Inc.* (E.D.N.Y.) – represented defendant in patent infringement action, which settled on terms favorable to our client
- *Tyco Healthcare Group LP, et al. v. Mutual Pharm Co., et al.*, (D.N.J.) – represented plaintiffs asserting patent infringement under the Hatch Waxman Act

Level 3 Communications, LLC (now Lumen Technologies, Inc.):

- *AIP Acquisition LLC v. Level 3 Communications, Inc.*, (E.D. Tex.) – managed patent litigation pertaining to routing telecommunication traffic according to economic considerations and assisted in prior art searches and drafting of *inter partes* review
- *C2 Communications Techs., Inc. v. Level 3 Communications, LLC, et al.*, (E.D. Tex.) – managed patent litigation pertaining to VoIP technology and served as the corporate representative for Level 3 during jury trial
- *GlobeTecTrust LLC v. Level 3 Communications, LLC*, (D. Del.) – managed patent litigation pertaining to “dead reckoning” routing of data packets
- *Level 3 Communications, LLC et al. v. Limelight Networks, Inc.*, (E.D. Tex.) – managed patent litigation pertaining to content delivery network (CDN) including overseeing large e-discovery review and production and responding to discovery requests

- *Rates Tech. Inc. v. Level Communications, Inc. and Global Crossing Ltd.*, (S.D.N.Y) – managed patent litigation and successfully obtained settlement on terms favorable to Level 3
- *Tierra Telecom, Inc. v. Level 3 Communications, Inc., et al.*, (E.D. Va.) – managed patent litigation including collection of responsive e-discovery and preparation of fact witnesses

Sheridan Ross, P.C.:

- *Aspen Roofing, Inc. v. Aspen Contracting, Inc.*, Civ. (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting unfair competition under the Lanham Act and violations under the C.C.P.A. among other claims
- *Austin Fresh Burger Bar Concepts LLC v. 5280 Sliders LLC et al.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting trademark infringement and unfair competition and obtained favorable settlement
- *Byler v. Elicit Life LLC et al.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff trademark and copyright holder
- *CQG, Inc. and CQG, LLC v. Chart Trading Dev., LLC*, (PTAB) – counsel for petitioner requesting review under the transitional program for covered business method patents of the AIA and obtaining an Order holding the challenged claims unpatentable
- *Futurm Communications LLC v. Adaptive Communications LLC et al.*, (Jeff. Cty. Colo.) – counsel for defendant against claims of trade secret misappropriation and breach of contract among other claims
- *In re Certain Overflow and Drain Assemblies for Bathtubs and Components Thereof, Inv.* (USITC) – counsel for complainant and successfully instituting an investigation pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1337
- *Inspire Commerce, Inc v. enVista Interactive Solutions LLC d/b/a Enspire Commerce*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting trademark infringement and seeking cancellation of competitor’s trademark
- *Level Terrain, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for Level Terrain, LLC in patent infringement action against largest on-line retailer and obtained settlement favorable to plaintiff patent holder
- *Litens Automotive v. Zen S.A. and Zen North America Corp.*, (S.D. Fla.) – counsel for defendants against claims of patent infringement relating to overrunning alternator decoupler pulleys. Defendants also asserted a patent misuse affirmative defense, and the action was resolved through settlement on terms favorable to Defendants

- *Meisinger USA, LLC v. Brasseler U.S.A. Inc.*, (D. Colo.) – local counsel for defendants and obtained settlement favorable to defendants
- *No-Bull Ent., LLC v. ZB Prods, LLC*, (W.D. Mich.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting patent infringement against competitor and obtaining settlement on terms favorable to client
- *Oldcastle Precast, Inc. v. Jensen Enterprises, Inc., d/b/a Jensen Precast*, (E.D. Cal.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting claims of patent infringement against a competitor in the precast concrete industry. The action resolved through settlement on terms favorable to Plaintiff
- *RD Fashion Group LLC v. Joseph McEvoy d/b/a Ridin Dirty Inc.*, (TTAB) – first-chair counsel for petitioner clothing retailer in successful cancellation action against the mark RYDIN DIRTY
- *RE/Max LLC v. GRP Realty, LLC et al.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff trademark holder
- *RE/Max LLC v. Quality Living, LLC et al.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff trademark holder and obtained treble damages and attorneys’ fees
- *Swift Distribution, LLC v. Starin Marketing, Inc.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting theft of trade secrets, among other claims
- *Terumo BCT, Inc. v. Noble House Group Party Ltd.*, (PTAB) – counsel for petitioner Terumo BCT, Inc., a global leader in blood component and cellular technologies, to earn a favorable *inter partes* review (IPR) decision from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB)
- *WCM Industries, Inc. v. Danco, Inc.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting patent infringement pertaining to plumbing technology
- *WCM Industries, Inc. v. BlueVue, Inc.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting patent infringement pertaining to plumbing technology
- *WCM Industries, Inc. v. Federal Process Corp., et al.*, (W.D. Tenn.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting patent infringement pertaining to plumbing technology
- *WCM Industries, Inc. v. IPS Corp., et al.*, (W.D. Tenn.) – counsel for plaintiff asserting patent infringement and obtaining a jury verdict finding willful infringement and awarding treble monetary damages and attorneys’ fees
- *WCM Industries, Inc. v. Legend Valve & Fitting, Inc.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff patent holder and obtained settlement favorable to the client

- *Wright & McGill CO v. Active Outdoors LLC et al.*, (D. Colo.) – counsel for plaintiff and counterclaim defendant seeking declaratory judgment of patent and trade dress invalidity and non-infringement pertaining to outdoor equipment products which settled on favorable terms
- *Taco Bell IP Holder, LLC v. Illegal Pete's, LLC*, (TTAB) – counsel for trademark applicant restaurateur in trademark opposition proceeding which settled on favorable terms

Charhon Callahan Robson & Garza, PLLC:

- *Bright Data Ltd. v. Code200, UAB et al.*, (E.D. Tex.) – counsel for defendants against claims of patent infringement pertaining to proxy server technologies
- *Bright Data Ltd. v. Teso LT, UAB, et al.*, (E.D. Tex.) – counsel for defendants against claims of patent infringement pertaining to proxy server technologies
- *Bright Data Ltd. v. Tefincom d/b/a NordVPN* (E.D. Tex.) – counsel for defendant against claims of patent infringement pertaining to proxy server technologies
- *Code200, UAB*, EPR No. 90/014,827 (U.S.P.T.O.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Code200, UAB et al.*, EPR No. 90/014,816 (U.S.P.T.O.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Code200, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2021-00122 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Code200, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2021-00249 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Perry Street Software, Inc. v. Jedi Technologies, Inc.*, (S.D.N.Y.) – counsel for plaintiff and counterclaim defendant seeking declaratory judgment of patent invalidity and non-infringement pertaining to mobile dating applications
- *Sable Networks, Inc. and Sable IP, LLC v. Cloudflare, Inc.*, (W.D. Tex.) – counsel for defendant against claims of patent infringement pertaining to telecommunication buffering technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al.*, EPR No. 90/014,875 (U.S.P.T.O.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al.*, EPR No. 90/019,025 (U.S.P.T.O.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies

- *Teso LT, UAB et al.*, EPR No. 90/014,876 (U.S.P.T.O.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2020-01266 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2022-00861 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2022-01109 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2020-01506 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2020-01358 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2022-00862 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies
- *Teso LT, UAB et al. v. Bright Data Ltd.*, IPR2022-01110 (P.T.A.B.) -- counsel for petitioners challenging claims directed towards proxy server technologies