

* BL

Majority Opinion >

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

GEIGTECH EAST BAY LLC, Plaintiff-Counter
Defendant, -against- LUTRON ELECTRONICS
CO., INC., Defendant-Counter Plaintiff, -against-
James Geiger, Counter Defendant.

18 Civ. 05290 (CM) 19 Civ. 04693 (CM) 20 Civ.
10195 (CM)

August 14, 2025, Filed

August 14, 2025, Decided

For Geigtech East Bay LLC, Plaintiff (1:18-cv-05290-CM): Gary Sorden, PRO HAC VICE, Aaron D Davidson, Amanda Leigh DeGroote, Kristopher M. Ruiz, Vishal H. Patel, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX; Brian King, PRO HAC VICE, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX; Donald A. Ottaunick, Cole Schotz Meisel Forman & Leonard, P.A. (NJ), Hackensack, NJ; Gianna Zapata, Pekham Pal, Cole Schotz P.C., Hackensack, NJ; Hoda Rifai-Bashjawish, Daignault Iyer LLP, Litigation, Vienna, VA; James R. Perkins, Caldwell Cassady Curry PC, Dallas, TX; Jed Matthew Weiss, Mandelbaum Barrett PC, New York, NY.

For James Geiger, Counter Defendant (1:18-cv-05290-CM): Brian King, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX; Gary Sorden, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX; Hoda Rifai-Bashjawish, Daignault Iyer LLP, Litigation, Vienna, VA; James R. Perkins, Caldwell Cassady Curry PC, Dallas, TX.

For Lutron Electronics Co., Inc., Counter Claimant (1:18-cv-05290-CM): James Wilson Dabney, LEAD ATTORNEY, James W. Dabney, Esq., Ridgewood, NJ; James D. Herschlein, Paul C. Llewellyn, LEAD ATTORNEYS, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY; Michael M Polka, LEAD ATTORNEY, Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP, Redwood Shores, CA; Scott W. Breedlove, LEAD ATTORNEY, Carter Arnett PLLC, Texas, TX; Alexis Leia Ritzer, Carter Arnett PLLC, Dallas, TX; Catherine Mapelli Langhans, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY; Monica Litle Goff, Carter Arnet PLLC, Dallas, TX; Omer Salik, Carter Arnett PLLC, TX, Dallas, TX.

For James Geiger, Counter Claimant (1:18-cv-05290-CM): James R. Perkins, Caldwell Cassady Curry PC, Dallas, TX.

For Geigtech East Bay LLC, Counter Defendant (1:18-cv-05290-CM): Brian King, PRO HAC VICE, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX; Gary Sorden, PRO HAC VICE, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX; James R. Perkins, Caldwell Cassady Curry PC, Dallas, TX; Jed Matthew Weiss, Mandelbaum Barrett PC, New York, NY.

For James Geiger, Counter Defendant (1:18-cv-05290-CM): Aaron D Davidson, Gary Sorden, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX; Brian King, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX; James R. Perkins, Caldwell Cassady Curry PC, Dallas, TX; Jed

Geigtech E. Bay LLC v. Lutron Elecs. Co., No. 18 Civ. 05290 (CM), 2025 BL 287450 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 14, 2025), Court Opinion

Matthew Weiss, Mandelbaum Barrett PC, New York, NY.

For Lutron Electronics Co., Inc., Counter Claimant (1:18-cv-05290-CM): James Wilson Dabney, LEAD ATTORNEY, James W. Dabney, Esq., Ridgewood, NJ; James D. Herschlein, Paul C. Llewellyn, LEAD ATTORNEYS, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY; Michael M Polka, LEAD ATTORNEY, Reichman Jorgensen Lehman & Feldberg LLP, Redwood Shores, CA; Scott W. Breedlove, LEAD ATTORNEY, Carter Arnett PLLC, Texas, TX; Alexis Leia Ritzer, Carter Arnett PLLC, Dallas, TX; Monica Litle Goff, Carter Arnett PLLC, Dallas, TX; Omer Salik, Carter Arnett PLLC, TX, Dallas, TX.

For Geigtech East Bay LLC, Counter Defendant (1:18-cv-05290-CM): Aaron D Davidson, Gary Sorden, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX; Brian King, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX; Hoda Rifai-Bashjawish, Daignault Iyer LLP, Litigation, Vienna, VA; James R. Perkins, Caldwell Cassady Curry PC, Dallas, TX; Jed Matthew Weiss, Mandelbaum Barrett PC, [*2] New York, NY.

For Geigtech East Bay LLC, Plaintiff (1:19cv4693): Gary Sorden, LEAD ATTORNEY, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX USA; Brian King, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX USA; Jed Matthew Weiss, Cole Scholtz, PC, New York, NY USA.

For Lutron Electronics Co., Inc., Defendant (1:19cv4693): James D. Herschlein, LEAD ATTORNEY, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY USA; Paul C. Llewellyn, LEAD ATTORNEY, Kaye Scholer, LLP (NYC), New York, NY USA; Scott W. Breedlove, Carter Arnett

PLLC, Texas, TX USA.

For Lutron Electronics Co., Inc., Counter Claimant (1:19cv4693): James D. Herschlein, LEAD ATTORNEY, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY USA; Scott W. Breedlove, Carter Arnett PLLC, Texas, TX USA.

For Geigtech East Bay LLC, Counter Defendant (1:19cv4693): Gary Sorden, LEAD ATTORNEY, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX USA; Brian King, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX USA; Jed Matthew Weiss, Cole Scholtz, PC, New York, NY USA.

For Geigtech East Bay LLC, Plaintiff (1:20cv10195): Brian King, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX USA; Gary Sorden, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX USA; James R. Perkins, COLE SCHOTZ, P.C., Dallas, TX USA; Molly G. Rothschild, Frankfurt Kurnit Klein & Selz, P.C., New York, NY USA; Jed Matthew Weiss, Cole Scholtz, PC, New York, NY USA.

For Lutron Electronics Co., Inc., Defendant (1:20cv10195): John S Torkelson, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Carter Arnett, PLLC, Dallas, TX USA; James D. Herschlein, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY USA; Minghui Yang, Carmichael IP PLLC, Tysons, VA USA; Paul C. Llewellyn, Kaye Scholer, LLP (NYC), New York, NY USA; Scott W. Breedlove, Carter Arnett PLLC, Texas, TX USA.

For James Geiger, Consolidated Counter Claimant (1:20cv10195): James R. Perkins, LEAD ATTORNEY, COLE SCHOTZ, P.C., Dallas, TX USA.

For James Geiger, Consolidated Counter

Defendant (1:20cv10195): Gary Sorden, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX USA; James R. Perkins, LEAD ATTORNEY, COLE SCHOTZ, P.C., Dallas, TX USA.

For Lutron Electronics Co., Inc., Counter Claimant (1:20cv10195): John S Torkelson, LEAD ATTORNEY, PRO HAC VICE, Carter Arnett, PLLC, Dallas, TX USA; James D. Herschlein, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY USA; Paul C. Llewellyn, Kaye Scholer, LLP (NYC), New York, NY USA; Scott W. Breedlove, Carter Arnett PLLC, Texas, TX USA.

For Geigtech East Bay LLC, Counter Defendant (1:20cv10195): Brian King, Cole Schotz, P.C., Dallas, TX USA; Gary Sorden, Cole Schotz P.C., Dallas, TX USA; James R. Perkins, COLE SCHOTZ, P.C., Dallas, TX USA; Molly G. Rothschild, Frankfurt Kurnit Klein & Selz, P.C., New York, NY USA; Jed Matthew Weiss, Cole Scholtz, PC, New York, NY USA.

Colleen McMahon, United States District Judge.

Colleen McMahon

FINAL JUDGMENT

Pursuant to [Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure](#), it is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** that, pursuant to two bench trials, the jury's verdict delivered on February 13, 2024, and the subsequent jury verdict delivered on November 20, 2024, the

Court enters judgment that:

1. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 10, 294,717 ("the '717 patent") are found to be infringed by Lutron Electronics Co., Inc. ("Lutron");
2. Lutron's infringement of the ' 717 patent was willful;
3. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, and 12 of the '717 patent are not invalid or unenforceable;
4. GeigTech East Bay LLC ("GeigTech") did not prove its trade dress claim under the Lanham Act or common law **[*3]** (Case No. 18-cv-05290, Dkt. No. 499);
5. Lutron did not prove its defamation claim against GeigTech or James Geiger;
6. GeigTech voluntarily dismissed its claim against Lutron for infringement of **U.S. Patent No. 9**, 237,821 without prejudice (Case No. 18-cv-05290, Dkt. No. 64), which the Court acknowledged in its November 29, 2018 Decision and Order (Case No. 18-cv-05290, Dkt. No. 65). Therefore, that claim is dismissed without prejudice;
7. GeigTech voluntarily withdrew its claim against Lutron for infringement of **U.S. Patent No. 10**, 822,872. I agree with GeigTech's cited authorities in "treat[ing] [GeigTech's] withdrawal of the claim[] as being akin to ... a **Rule 41(a)** voluntary dismissal of claims without prejudice." *SanDisk Corp. v. Kingston Tech. Co.*, **695 F.3d 1348, 1353** (Fed. Cir. 2012). Therefore, that claim is also dismissed without prejudice;

8. GeigTech is awarded damages from and against Lutron in the amount of **\$5,344,000**, including the Court's enhancement by a factor of two on the amount the jury awarded as damages (Case No. 18-cv-05290, Dkt. No. 598);

9. GeigTech is awarded prejudgment interest in the amount of **\$453,832.09** (Case No. 18-cv-05290, Dkt. No. 598) (Dkt. No. 601-1 ¶ 7);¹

10. GeigTech is awarded costs of court in the amount of **\$159,921.06** (Case No. 18-cv-05290, Dkt. No. 598);²

11. Post-judgment interest on the entire amount of the judgment amount, including enhanced damages, prejudgment interest, and costs, shall accrue from the date of judgment (August 14, 2025) until such time that Lutron pays the full judgment amount, with the amount of post-judgment interest determined pursuant to **28 U.S.C. §1961** as 3.90% (the weekly average 1-year constant maturity Treasury yield, as published by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, for the calendar week ending on August 8, 2025), calculated daily and compounding annually from August 14, 2025 (Case No. 18-cv-05290, Dkt. No. 598);

12. Final Judgment is further entered against Lutron granting injunctive relief as set forth in the Court's Order granting a Permanent Injunction (Case No. 18-cv-05290, Dkt. No. 535):

Defendant and its officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and all those persons in active concert or participation with Lutron (or in active concert or participation with its officers, agents, servants,

employees, attorneys) be permanently restrained and enjoined from making, offering for sale, selling, importing (into), or installing in the United States: (a) the adjudged Palladiom Shading System products found to infringe claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, or 12 of the '717 patent, and (b) any Lutron shading system product that is not colorably different from the adjudged infringing Palladiom. Shading System products with respect to those elements proven to satisfy the limitations of claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, or 12 of the '717 patent. However, Defendant is not enjoined from importing existing stock of the infringing Product in order to modify those shades to incorporate the newly designed Palladiom feature that Lutron claims to be non-infringing. This injunction will remain in effect until the expiration of the '717 patent.

13. Entry of this **FINAL JUDGMENT** resolves all claims of all parties and starts the time for filing any appeal.

SO [*4] ORDERED

Dated: August 14, 2025

/s/ Colleen McMahon

U.S.D.J.

fn

1

Prejudgment interest is calculated by taking the \$2,672,000 judgment and compounding it annually over 6.23 years at a rate of 2.55% - the average bank discount rate between May 21, 2019 and August 13, 2025. As Lutron explains, this average interest rate comes closest to the objective of making GeigTech whole. The bank discount rate is also the more appropriate rate to use in calculating interest for Treasury *Bills*, as opposed to *notes* or *bonds*.

Lutron's attempt to argue that costs should be disallowed for litigation misconduct is unavailing. Further, GeigTech is correct that [28 U.S.C. § 1920\(4\)](#) permits "Fees for exemplification," which courts in this district have held to "includ[e] charts, blow-ups and computer graphics." *DiBella v. Hopkins*, [407 F. Supp. 2d 537, 539-40](#) (S.D.N.Y. 2005). I see no reason to follow Lutron's recommendation that I deny costs for GeigTech's technology consultants or for the creation of PowerPoint presentations that appear to fall squarely within the federal rule.

fn

2

General Information

Case Name	Geigtech E. Bay LLC v. Lutron Elecs. Co.
Court	U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York
Date Filed	Thu Aug 14 00:00:00 EDT 2025
Judge(s)	COLLEEN MCMAHON
Parties	GEIGTECH EAST BAY LLC, Plaintiff-Counter Defendant, -against- LUTRON ELECTRONICS CO., INC., Defendant-Counter Plaintiff, - against- James Geiger, Counter Defendant.
Topic(s)	Civil Procedure; Patent Law