

## Michael P. Mazza

### Exemplary List of Cases in Which Mike Mazza Has Had Primary or Significant Involvement

- *Allen-Edmonds Shoe Corporation v. Sam The Shoe Doctor, Inc. et al.*, 98C6143 (N.D. Ill. 1999) (successfully enforced trademark, resulting in consent judgment order and settlement agreement)
- *Jeffrey L. Buschur v. Church & Dwight Co., Inc.*, Case No. 03-71404 (E.D. Mich. 2003) (enforced plaintiff's patents resulting in confidential settlement agreement and consent judgment order confirming validity of patents)
- *C&F Packing Co. v. IBP, Inc.*, 93C1601 (N.D. Ill., Williams, J.), 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2158 (successfully argued summary judgment motion in patent case involving trade secrets for pizza toppings)
- *F&G Scrolling Mouse, LLC v. IBM Corp.*, 1:99CV460 (M.D. N.C.), 190 F.R.D. 385, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20186 (Oct. 26, 1999); (N.D. Ill.), 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7241 (May 11, 1999) (extensive involvement in patent case involving computer mouse; confidential settlement)
- *F&G Scrolling Mouse, LLC v. Microsoft Corporation, Key Tronic Corporation*, 98C7655 (N.D. Ill.), 56 F.Supp.2d 1005, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17470 (May 11, 1999) (extensive involvement in trade secret case resulting in jury verdict against Key Tronic for \$16 million for misappropriation of trade secrets involving 3-D computer mouse; settled)
- *Galion Solid Waste Equipment, Inc. v. Waste-Quip, Inc. and Dempster, Inc.* C2-94-1129 (S.D. Ohio, 1995) (successfully argued *Markman* and summary judgment hearing in patent case involving recyclers; settled)
- *Galion Solid Waste Equipment, Inc. v. The Heil Company*, C2-94-0156 (S.D. Ohio, 1995) (enforcing recycler patents in case involving recyclers; confidential settlement)
- *Galion Holding Company, Inc. v. Toccoa Metal Technologies, Inc.*, C2-96-385 (S.D. Ohio 1997) (successfully enforced patent recycler patents, resulting in consent judgment order and license agreement)
- *IEM v. Fast-Trac* (D. Minn. 1998) (successfully argued PI and summary judgment hearings regarding snowmobile fasteners, resulting in invalidity of patent asserted against client; first chair patent case)
- *Induction Innovations Inc. v. Ajax Tocco Magnethermic Corporation*. Case No. 07-CV-0369 (N.D. Ill. 2007) (patent infringement lawsuit resulting in confidential settlement agreement)

- *Jack Web v. Amato et al*, (N.D. Ill., 2000) (appointed as pro bono attorney by court; achieved confidential settlement with City of Chicago on eve of trial, in civil rights case).
- *Microelectronic Modules Corporation v. Maxim Integrated Products, Inc.* (E.D. Wis., 2001) (argued *Markman* and summary judgment hearings in patent case involving switching regulators; confidential settlement).
- *Mahurkar v. C.R. Bard, Inc.* (summary judgment and jury (validity and infringement) and bench (damages) trials in case involving enforcement of catheter patent; significant involvement in each) (N.D. Ill., Zagel, J.), multi-million dollar verdict affirmed on appeal, 79 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 29, 1996).
- *Miami Beverage, Inc. v. A.J. Canfield Co.*, S91-00230S (N.D. Ind. 1993) (successfully defended breach of contract and trademark claim).
- *PSN Illinois, LLC v. Grain Processing Corp. and The Andersons, Inc.*, Case No. 04 C 6061 (N.D. Ill. 2004) (enforced plaintiff's patents concerning clumping animal litter, resulting in confidential settlement agreements)
- *PSN Illinois, LLC v. Ivoclar Vivadent, Inc. et al.*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21044 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 21, 2005) (manufacturer's patent misuse, unfair competition, and deceptive trade practices counterclaims dismissed where patent misuse was an affirmative defense, not a counterclaim, and there were no allegations of any disparaging comments by the patent holder outside of the lawsuit).
- *PSN Illinois, LLC v. Ivoclar Vivadent, Inc. et al.*, 398 F. Supp. 2d 902 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 10, 2005) (maker of porcelain veneers, sued for infringement on a porcelain restoration patent, failed to establish, as a matter of law, the required elements of the laches defense because the patent owner raised triable issues of material fact concerning when it knew or should have known about the veneer maker's alleged use of porcelain powder)
- *PSN Illinois, LLC v. Oil-Dri Corporation Of America*, Case No. 04 C 0915 (N.D. Ill. 2004) (enforced plaintiff's patents concerning clumping animal litter, resulting in settlement agreement including \$1.25 million payment)
- *PSN Illinois, LLC v. The Andersons, Inc.*, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24496 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 2, 2004) (in a patent infringement case against Ohio and Iowa corporations, transfer of venue was not warranted because, *inter alia*, venue was not proper in Iowa and the inconveniences of the parties and witnesses were more or less equivalent).
- *Quinton Instruments Co. v. IMPRA, Inc. (In re Mahurkar Double Lumen Hemodialysis Catheter Patent Litigation)* (extensive involvement in summary judgment hearings and bench trial in patent case enforcing catheter patents (N.D. Ill., Easterbrook, J.), affirmed on appeal, 71 F.3d 1573 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (multi-million dollar verdict affirmed on appeal)

- *Robert Golden d/b/a Leg Lamp Factory v. Brian Jones and Red Rider Leg Lamps, Inc.*, Case No. 1:06-cv-5494 (N.D. Ill. 2007) (represented leg lamp manufacturer in copyright infringement lawsuit resulting in confidential settlement agreement).
- *Schofield v. United States Steel Corp.*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30471 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 28, 2005) (plaintiff's attorney's deposition testimony waived the attorney-client privilege as to certain matters, but only the narrow matters actually discussed in his testimony; therefore, defendant was not entitled to production of all documents that simply related to the patent at issue because the waiver was not that broad).
- *Schofield v. United States Steel Corp.*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30478 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 7, 2005) (individual patent owner entitled to conduct a plant inspection but had to set forth with reasonable particularity the items and parts of the plant to be inspected; patent owner was not required to submit to defendant's conditions as to the number of representatives at any inspection so long as the number was reasonable).
- *Schofield v. United States Steel Corp.*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30481 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 28, 2005) (individual patent owner's motion to compel discovery was granted, where proposed procedure of photographing and videotaping vault and contents complied with Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a); however, sanctions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a), (d) were not appropriate, as company met "substantially justified" standard; company offered alternative to photographing).
- *Schreiber Foods, Inc. v. Beatrice Cheese, Kustner Industries, S.A.*, (Markman hearing and August, 1998 trial; significant involvement in each in enforcing patents directed to individual wrapping cheese singles machines in food processing industry; jury verdict of \$26 million affirmed on appeal at 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 11819 (Fed. Cir. 2002))
- *Schreiber Foods, Inc. v. Natec Reich Summer GmbH & Co. Kg. and Beatrice Cheese, Inc.*, 95-C-0542 (E.D. Wis. 1996) (successfully enforced patents for individual wrapping cheese singles machines; confidential settlement)
- *SwitchPower, Inc. v. Celestica Corporation*, C-01-21051 RMW (N.D. Cal. 2002) (enforcing circuit protection patent as first chair; confidential settlement)
- *Thor Technology Corporation v. Nellcor Puritan Bennett Incorporated*, 98C0278 (E.D. Wis. 1999) (enforced oximeter sensor patent; argued Markman hearing, first chair; confidential settlement).
- *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, (Easterbrook, J.), involved in summary judgment and appellate hearings and briefing, 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. June 7, 1991) (precedential decision finding that drawings alone may satisfy written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. Section 112).

- *Vulcan International, Inc. v. Jerr-Dan Corporation*, Case No. 2:94-CV034-B-0 (N.D. Miss.), 31 USPQ2d 1911 (obtained preliminary injunction enforcing patent for wheel retainers in vehicle recovery industry; settled).
- *Zohar et al. v. MTN et al.*, Case No. 06 C 5294 (N.D. Ill. 2006) (defended water cooler manufacturer in patent infringement action, resulting in confidential settlement agreement).