

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

ULTRAVISION TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHENZHEN ABSEN OPTOELECTRONIC
CO., LTD., ABSEN, INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-00112-JRG

FINAL JUDGMENT

A jury trial commenced in the above-captioned case on June 3, 2021, and on June 11, 2021, the jury reached and returned its unanimous verdict finding that Defendants Shenzhen Absen Optoelectronic Co., Ltd. and Absen, Inc. (collectively, “Absen”) did not infringe any of Claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 9,916,782, Claim 22 of U.S. Patent No. 9,978,294, and Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 9,207,904 (collectively, the “Asserted Claims”); and that Claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 9,916,782, Claim 22 of U.S. Patent No. 9,978,294, and Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 9,207,904 are invalid. (Dkt. No. 690).

Pursuant to Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and in accordance with the jury’s unanimous verdict and the entirety of the record, the Court hereby **ORDERS** and **ENTERS JUDGMENT** as follows:

1. Absen did not infringe any of the Asserted Claims;
2. Claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 9,916,782 is invalid;
3. Claim 22 of U.S. Patent No. 9,978,294 is invalid;
4. Claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 9,207,904 is invalid;

5. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d), Local Rule CV-54, and 28 U.S.C. § 1920, Defendants are the prevailing parties in this case and shall recover their costs from Plaintiff Ultravision Technologies, LLC; and
6. All other requests for relief now pending and requested by either party but not specifically addressed herein are **DENIED**.

All other requests for relief regarding the above-captioned case, including but not limited to Motions pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285, shall be filed within 28 days of this Judgment.

The Clerk of the Court is directed to **CLOSE** the above-captioned case.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 14th day of June, 2021.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE