

Recent Major Victories

In re Credit Default Swaps Antitrust Litigation — Historic \$1.86 Billion Antitrust Class Action Settlement

The firm was appointed lead counsel for a class of investors, including pension funds, university endowment funds, hedge funds, insurance companies, corporate treasuries, fiduciary and depository institutions, small banks, and money managers. The defendants were twelve major Wall Street banks, including Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, and JPMorgan, as well as Markit, a financial services firm, and the International Swaps and Derivatives Association (“ISDA”). The case involved allegations that the banks, Markit, and ISDA, engaged in a multi-year conspiracy to limit transparency and boycott exchange trading in the market for CDS. We achieved an historic settlement of over \$1.86 billion plus injunctive relief, one of the largest private antitrust settlements in history. The settlement is particularly noteworthy because two separate governmental investigations—by the Department of Justice and the European Commission—failed to result in any penalties for any of the defendants.

Weisfelner v. Blavatnik, et al.

We recently obtained a trial victory for Access Industries, Inc. (“Access”), and various of its officers and related companies, in a multi-billion dollar lawsuit brought by a Litigation Trustee representing various creditors of LyondellBasell Industries AF SCA (“LBI”). LBI was owned by Access entities and created through a merger of two energy companies in 2007. It filed for bankruptcy in early 2009. Shortly after the bankruptcy filing, the Trustee brought numerous claims against Access and its founder, Len Blavatnik, alleging mismanagement and fraud in the creation of LBI and seeking to recover billions of dollars in damages and allegedly fraudulent transfers. Following a 13-day bench trial in the Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, the judge issued a 177-page decision finding for Access on all but one small claim (resulting in an award of only \$7.2 million).

Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al. — 8-0 Design Patent Victory in the U.S. Supreme Court

We obtained a unanimous victory in the first design-patent case to reach the U.S. Supreme Court in more than a century. The Court reversed a Federal Circuit decision that had upheld a \$399 million judgment against Samsung for infringement of design-for portions of a smartphone’s exterior case or display screen. Adopting our reading of the pertinent statute, the Court held that a design-patent plaintiff is entitled to recover only for profits made from the product component (such as a smartphone’s outer case) that was allegedly infringed – and not all profits calculated on the basis of the entire product as sold (such as a smartphone itself).

The Broad Institute, Inc. v. The Regents of the University of California, University of Vienna, and Emmanuelle Charpentier

We represented The Broad Institute, Inc. in a patent interference requested by the University of California and Emmanuelle Charpentier in order to challenge key Broad patents directed to use

of the breakthrough CRISPR gene-editing technology. We obtained a victory as the PTAB declared there was no interference in fact and dismissed the interference, thereby allowing our client to retain its key eukaryotic-related patents. The PTAB decision was widely reported in the press, where it was described as "A Knockout in the Biotech Fight of the Century" (Fortune) and "a blow to the University of California" in "a bitterly fought dispute" (NY Times).

Various Odebrecht Matters

We represented the Odebrecht Group, the largest construction conglomerate in South America, in a number of criminal and civil actions, including what the U.S. DOJ has described as "the largest-ever global foreign bribery resolution." The criminal resolution resulted from a multi-jurisdictional investigation (Brazil, U.S., Switzerland) arising out of the Lava Jato Operation and involved US\$ 788 million in illicit payments to Petrobras officials, Brazilian politicians, and public officials in 12 countries on three continents. We helped Odebrecht obtain a global fine of US\$ 2.6 billion, less than half of the minimum provided for under the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines, and later negotiated a 20% reduction in the amount owed to the U.S. Our efforts were critical in ensuring the company's continued survival. We also successfully defended Odebrecht in a number of related civil lawsuits. In the first two bellwethers for determining the extent to which U.S. litigants could use the guilty plea to obtain damages from the company, the team obtained complete dismissals of all claims against Odebrecht. Both courts ruled for Odebrecht on the merits and held that Odebrecht is not subject to jurisdiction in the United States, a holding which other Lava Jato defendants have not been able to secure.

Edison v. ENI North Africa — EUR 1 Billion International Arbitration Victory

On November 27, 2015, we obtained an arbitral award retroactively reducing by more than EUR 1 billion (without interest) the price paid by our client Edison under a 35-year gas supply contract. This billion-dollar result is one of the largest amounts ever awarded in a price review arbitration. It is a major victory that will make a huge impact in the market and reinforces our reputation in the field. In an unusual fashion, Edison's press release does mention the fact that we represented Edison in the arbitration.

SimpleAir v. Google — Patent Defense Win in E.D. Texas

The firm recently obtained a complete defense verdict for Google in an E.D. Texas patent case where plaintiff SimpleAir sought hundreds of millions in damages. In a prior case on related patents, handled by predecessor counsel, SimpleAir had prevailed against Google in a 2014 jury trial and obtained an award of \$85 million (which we later convinced the Federal Circuit to reverse). SimpleAir had also previously sued on related patents and obtained settlements from a number of large technology companies, including Apple, Microsoft, Amazon, and Facebook. SimpleAir then filed suit *again* on two continuation patents, accusing the same Google product of infringing the continuation patents. We were retained as replacement lead counsel to represent Google in the appeal of the 2014 verdict and to try the second case. After nearly six hours of deliberation, the jury returned a verdict of no infringement. *The Recorder* headlined Google's victory aptly as "Google Gets Sweet Revenge in E.D. Texas Patent Case," and *The American Lawyer* headlined the win as "Google Avoids New IP Headache With Help from Quinn Emanuel."

FHFA v. Nomura — Structured Finance \$800 Million Trial Victory

The firm won a trial verdict of more than \$800 million for the Federal Housing Finance Agency in addition to approximately \$20 billion previously recovered in settlements arising out of the 2008 financial crisis. In an historic partnership between a government regulator and a private law firm, the firm has represented the FHFA, as Conservator for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, in more than a dozen cases filed against major investment banks for claims arising out of misrepresentations about residential mortgage-backed securities. As widely reported, this is the single largest set of actions ever filed on behalf of a governmental entity. Most of the investment banks have settled. So far, one case, FHFA's action against Nomura and RBS, has gone to trial. In May 2015, the court issued a 361-page decision that fully vindicated the merits of FHFA's claims and required Nomura and RBS to pay an \$806 million judgment in exchange for the securities, plus attorneys' fees and costs.

United States v. Joseph Sigelman — FCPA Trial Victory

The firm convinced the Department of Justice to drop a high profile Foreign Corrupt Practices Act prosecution *mid-trial*, resulting in the client receiving a sentence of probation and no jail time. In one of only a few FCPA cases ever to be tried, the Government dropped five-and-a-half of six charges against Mr. Sigelman after an admission by the Government's star witness that he made false statements to the jury on direct examination. The judge referred to the firm's cross examination of the Government's star witness as "bloodletting." Mr. Sigelman had been facing a possible sentence of 20 years in prison. Instead, the Government agreed to a plea deal in which he received a sentence of probation with no incarceration. These types of plea offers in the middle of trial rarely occur.

In re Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation — \$430 Million Antitrust Class Action Settlement

The firm obtained over \$430 million in settlements for purchasers of flexible polyurethane foam in an antitrust class action. As court-appointed co-lead counsel for direct purchaser plaintiffs in *In re Flexible Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Ohio), the firm won certification of a national class of direct purchasers, defeated the defendants' effort to have the certification decision reversed on appeal, and defeated those same defendants' motions for summary judgment. As a result of this case, the class will receive over \$430 million in settlements from nine different defendants.

Republic of Djibouti et al. v. DP World FZCO et al.

We represented DP World in an international arbitration before the London Court of Arbitration concerning allegations by the Republic of Djibouti that DP World had paid bribes to obtain contracts under which DP World designed, built, and was operating a state-of-the art container terminal in Djibouti in exchange for 33% ownership of the terminal and a management fee. Djibouti initiated the arbitration in an effort to rescind or terminate the contracts and either take full ownership of the terminal or receive hundreds of millions in damages. By unanimous vote, the tribunal completely exonerated DP World, rejected all of Djibouti's claims, and ordered Djibouti to pay DP World's legal and other costs.

Morales-Santana v. Lynch — Pro Bono Constitutional Law Victory

Acting as court-appointed *pro bono* appellate counsel, the firm obtained a landmark ruling by the Second Circuit striking as unconstitutional sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act which had been on the books for more than sixty years. The Second Circuit ruled that those sections of the INA that denied citizenship to the children of unwed U.S. citizen fathers but conferred citizenship on the children of unwed U.S. citizen mothers were unconstitutional under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Mr. Morales—who had been in federal detention subject to a deportation order for over two years—was released the day after the Second Circuit issued its decision and is now an American citizen. The decision has broad implications for numerous individuals who are now deemed to be American citizens as of birth.

National Australia Bank v. Goldman Sachs — \$100 Million Structured Finance Arbitration Victory

The firm obtained a \$100 million award on behalf of National Australia Bank in a FINRA arbitration against Goldman Sachs arising out of Goldman's sale to NAB of \$80 million of CDOs. The award is one of the three largest in the history of FINRA. NAB alleged that Goldman fraudulently misrepresented that the investment was highly-rated "conservative," "transparent," and "stable," and that NAB's interests would be "aligned" with Goldman's when, in reality, Goldman was using the investment to offload unwanted subprime risk in advance of the impending implosion of the U.S. subprime market. When the CDOs ultimately failed, NAB lost its investment, while Goldman profited handsomely. After a three-week arbitration hearing, the panel awarded NAB \$80 million in compensatory damages and an additional \$20 million in prejudgment interest, for a total damage award of \$100 million.

IP Engine v. AOL, et al. — Patent Appeal Victory

The firm won an appeal before the Federal Circuit that overturned a \$30.5 million verdict in a patent infringement case and invalidated all of the asserted patent claims. The firm represented Google, AOL, IAC, Target, and Gannett in litigation arising from Google's AdWords and AdSense systems. A federal jury had awarded the plaintiff \$30.5 million at trial. In addition, the district court imposed ongoing royalties amounting to 1.35% of Google's accused U.S. AdWords and AdSense revenues from 2012-2016. The firm obtained a ruling by the Federal Circuit overturning the verdict and finding that all of the asserted patent claims were invalid for obviousness.

In the Matter of Certain Opaque Polymers (The Dow Chemical Company v. Organik Kimya) — Patent Trial Victory

The firm obtained an unprecedented judgment on the merits against a Defendant as well as the longest exclusion order and highest discovery sanctions in the history of the U.S. International Trade Commission. The firm represented Dow Chemical Company in an action against Organik Kimya for patent infringement, unfair trade practices and misappropriation of trade secrets related to opaque polymers. During discovery, the firm obtained multiple orders for forensic inspection of Organik Kimya's computers which uncovered evidence of massive trade secret misappropriation and spoliation of evidence. For the first time ever, the ITC ordered a default judgment in Dow's favor on the merits of its trade secret claims based on Organik Kimya's spoliation. The ITC also imposed \$2 million in monetary sanctions and granted an

unprecedented 25-year exclusion order and cease and desist order. This is the longest exclusion order and the highest sanctions for a discovery violation in the history of the ITC.

Clemmy's LLC v. Nestle USA, Inc. and Nestle Dreyer's Ice Cream Co. — Antitrust Summary Judgment Victory

The firm won summary judgment for Nestle USA, Inc. and Nestle Dreyer's Ice Cream Co. in an antitrust case filed by Clemmy's LLC in California state court. Clemmy's alleged that Nestle conspired with retailers and distributors to exclude competition in the market for "better for you" ice cream sold in supermarkets nationwide. Following two years of discovery, the firm filed a motion for summary judgment on the grounds that there was no evidence of any conspiracy. The court ruled in Nestle's favor from the bench, granted summary judgment on the antitrust claim. This was a rare and extraordinary result, especially in California state court.

In re Zoloft Prods. Liab. Litig. — Products Liability Victory

We represent Pfizer in litigation alleging that use of Zoloft during pregnancy has caused birth defects in some children. On December 23, 2016, the Mass Litigation Panel of West Virginia entered an order granting summary judgment in the last two West Virginia cases. At the outset, there were almost 40 cases pending before the Panel, filed by a Texas attorney seeking to avoid the federal multidistrict litigation. In 2014, we had successfully obtained dismissal on grounds of forum non conveniens of 29 cases, while others were voluntarily dismissed, leaving only 4 cases remaining in West Virginia state court. Earlier this year, we successfully moved for summary judgment in two of those cases. The remaining two were scheduled for trial in mid-January, but as a result of consistent pressure applied by us during discovery, Plaintiffs withdrew their liability expert and we moved for summary judgment. Rejecting the Plaintiffs' arguments that an expert witness on the adequacy of the Zoloft label was not required, the Panel granted our motion for summary judgment. This most recent victory follows our prior victory in a federal MDL where, after the court excluded or limited Plaintiffs' causation experts on Daubert grounds, over 300 cases were voluntarily dismissed and summary judgment was granted in over 300 remaining cases.

BSI SA: DOJ Swiss Bank Program — Category 2 Non-Prosecution Agreement

The firm secured the first non-prosecution agreement for a Swiss bank under the unprecedented US-Swiss program to resolve the criminal liability of Swiss banks that helped Americans evade taxes. The firm's client, BSI SA, is one of the world's largest private banks and the first out of 100 banks to reach such an agreement. Through the agreement, the firm was able to reduce BSI's penalty from close to \$1 billion to \$211 million through negotiations with the DOJ and reaching out to the BSI's U.S. clients to convince them to either provide evidence that their accounts were declared or to make a voluntary disclosure to the IRS. The firm also successfully avoided the prosecution of numerous BSI executives, in contrast to investigations of the BSI's peers. This was the culmination of a two-year effort that involved more than 20 of our lawyers from seven of our U.S. and European offices.

Quadrant Structured Products Company, Ltd. v. Vertin — Bet-the-Company Defense Verdict

After a week-long trial, the firm won a complete defense verdict—plaintiff was awarded nothing and lost on every count—in a bet-the-company case. The firm represented Athilon Capital Corp. and its board of directors in a lawsuit brought by Quadrant Structured Products LLC (owned by

Magnetar) in Delaware Chancery Court. Quadrant sought not only hundreds of millions of dollars and findings of breach of fiduciary duty against the members of the Athilon board as individuals, but also an order requiring Athilon to liquidate its assets and shut its business down entirely. Instead, Vice Chancellor Laster denied all the relief Quadrant requested, leaving Athilon free to continue the long-term business strategy Quadrant challenged at trial.

Core Carbon Group ApS v. Centergasservice-opt LLC/Rosgazifikatsiya OJSC — International Arbitration Victory

We represented an international investor in carbon-credit related projects in Russia in Stockholm Chamber of Commerce arbitration proceedings against Russian counterparties arising out of the failure of the projects. Following fiercely contested proceedings, we were successful in obtaining an Award for our client which found in their favor on all substantive issues and awarded them damages in excess of \$150 million, together with all legal and other costs of the arbitration.

Dismissal/Acquittal on all Charges in the BP Deepwater Horizon Explosion & Oil Spill

We represented an individual facing 23 federal criminal counts arising out of the BP Oil Spill. He was accused of causing oil pollution and manslaughter. Over a 3 year battle, we first obtained dismissal of all the manslaughter counts before trial on the grounds that the statutes the government was prosecuting under did not apply to off-shore activities so far into the ocean. As to the remaining counts, a jury unanimously acquitted our client, finding that he did not cause the disaster in the first place.

Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc., et al. v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., et al. — \$1.4 Billion Settlement

We represented the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors of Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. in litigation against JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. concerning collateral JPMorgan obtained from Lehman pre-petition and the close out of derivatives transactions between the two institutions post-petition, resulting in a settlement that included a cash payment by JPMorgan to the Lehman estate of over \$1.4 billion.

Adaptix v. Alcatel-Lucent USA, Inc. — E.D. Texas Patent Trial Victory

We won a complete defense jury trial victory, and an award of attorneys fees, against Acacia, a well-known patent assertion entity, in the Eastern District of Texas. In the aftermath, the Acacia's CEO resigned and its stock price plummeted.

Exclaim Marketing, LLC v. DIRECTV, LLC — Complete Defense Victory for DIRECTV

We represented DIRECTV in a case brought by Exclaim Marketing involving unfair and deceptive trade practices and cross-claims for trademark infringement. After a seven-day jury trial and post-trial briefing, we not only obtained a complete defensive victory for DIRECTV, but also won substantial damages and a sweeping nationwide permanent injunction against Exclaim.

David Netzer Consulting Engineer LLC v. Shell Oil Co. et al. — Appellate Patent Appeal Victory for Shell

We represented Shell in a patent infringement appeal involving benzene purification and won a unanimous affirmance from the Federal Circuit that Shell did not infringe the asserted patent. The Federal Circuit adopted our claim construction and non-infringement arguments in full.

Antitrust Action Against FIFA —Motion to Dismiss Granted

On behalf of the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA), the firm obtained dismissal of an antitrust class action, alleging hundreds of millions of dollars. FIFA had hosted the World Cup in Brazil in 2014. In September 2015, two individuals filed a class action against FIFA and other entities in Las Vegas alleging that the sale of hospitality packages to the 2014 World Cup was the result of an international conspiracy in violation of the antitrust laws and civil RICO – both of which allow recovery of treble damages. The crux of the complaint was that FIFA and its co-defendants had tricked consumers into buying more expensive hospitality packages instead of face-value tickets. The firm spotted a fatal flaw in Plaintiffs' case — *neither of the named plaintiffs had in fact purchased a hospitality package to any match at the 2014 World Cup*. The firm, without conducting discovery, moved to dismiss with prejudice, on multiple grounds, including the plaintiffs' lack of standing. The motion was granted.

Internal Investigation of BTG— Results Cleared Client of Alleged Wrongdoing

The firm represented a special committee formed by the Board of Directors of BTG, the largest private investment bank in Latin America, in a wide-ranging internal investigation following the arrest of BTG's former CEO, on bribery and corruption charges. That arrest disrupted the Brazilian markets and BTG's operations, as many clients withdrew money from its investment funds. We conducted a four-month long internal investigation into the allegations and concluded they did not have any merit. Since announcing the results of the investigation at a press conference at the Bank's headquarters in Sao Paulo, and meeting with interested current and former investors, the executive was released and the Bank's business operations have stabilized.

Criminal Proceedings against Virginia Maureen McDonnell — U.S. Supreme Court Vacated Convictions

We defended former First Lady of Virginia Maureen McDonnell against federal bribery and obstruction charges brought against her and her husband, former Governor of Virginia Bob McDonnell. Mrs. McDonnell was convicted of obstruction of justice and certain corruption charges after a six-week trial in 2014. Post-conviction we persuaded the trial court to vacate the obstruction of justice conviction on the ground that it was not supported by the evidence. We then appealed, arguing that the trial court incorrectly defined bribery and effectively directed the jury to convict. The U.S. Supreme Court agreed with our position and vacated the convictions in a unanimous opinion. The government had the option to attempt to re-try the case under the new standard established by the Supreme Court. After meeting with us, in which we argued that the charges should be dismissed, the government announced it was abandoning the case against our client and the Governor.

Pfizer Asbestos Case — Summary Judgment Affirmed in Products Liability Case

We represent Pfizer in hundreds of asbestos cases alleging that Pfizer should be liable as the "apparent manufacturer" of products that had been manufactured by a former subsidiary Quigley

Company. (All other claims against Pfizer arising out of Quigley products are enjoined and channeled to a bankruptcy trust, which Pfizer has funded.) Pfizer has successfully obtained summary judgment in every "apparent manufacturer" case decided to date. In May 2016, the Maryland Court of Special Appeals unanimously affirmed summary judgment, holding that Pfizer was not an "apparent manufacturer" of Quigley products as a matter of law. This decision effectively wipes out over 500 pending cases in Maryland state court and sets a valuable precedent for Pfizer as it continues to litigate these cases in other courts around the country.

AIG Whistleblower Litigation — Dismissal of False Claims Act Claim

The firm obtained dismissal with prejudice of a major False Claims Act case against AIG that alleged AIG defrauded the Federal Reserve Bank of New York by hundreds of millions of dollars during the financial crisis. The case, brought by a former AIG human resources executive-turned-whistleblower, alleged that two insurance subsidiaries that AIG sold to the Federal Reserve in exchange for \$25 billion in debt reduction had, for decades, were unlicensed, complicit in illegal insurance activity, concealed those activities from regulators, and deliberately misled the Fed to consummate the transaction. This case posed a potential \$2.5 billion liability for AIG under the False Claims Act's treble damages provision. We previously convinced the Justice Department to decline to intervene in the suit, and after a three-hour long oral argument the court issued an opinion granting our motion and adopting nearly every one of our arguments.

Ronald Perelman companies against Michael Milken —Unanimous Court of Appeal Decision Affirming Summary Judgment

We obtained a unanimous decision from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit for Michael Milken in a \$135 million suit brought by Ronald Perelman's companies alleging fraud in an educational software company transaction. The Perelman entities originally sued Mr. Milken in Texas state court, but we removed the case to a Texas federal court and then successfully moved to transfer the case to a Delaware federal court. Summary judgment was based on a ruling that Mr. Milken was a "non-recourse party" and that the contract at issue disclaimed any right of the plaintiffs to rely on the alleged extra-contractual misrepresentations. The Third Circuit unanimously affirmed, finding the non-recourse provision "plain as can be" in barring any suit against Mr. Milken. But obtaining an opinion that a provision was "plain" required detailed work and clear prose to fend off plaintiffs' counsel's arguments that the provision was anything but plain as can be.

Multidistrict Lipitor Litigation — Order Excluding Expert Opinion

The firm is lead and national counsel for Pfizer in federal multidistrict litigation (MDL) in which it is alleged that use of the cholesterol medication Lipitor causes type 2 diabetes. On March 30, 2016, the MDL court excluded the causation opinions of three of the plaintiffs' four general causation experts, while limiting the opinions of the fourth expert to the highest dose of Lipitor at 80 mg, and excluding his opinions as to the more common 10, 20, and 40 mg doses.

Multidistrict Zolofit Litigation — Summary Judgment on Causation

The firm is lead and national counsel for Pfizer in federal multidistrict litigation (MDL) in which it is alleged that maternal use of Zolofit during pregnancy causes cardiac birth defects. On April 5, 2016, the MDL court granted Pfizer summary judgment as to the nearly 400 remaining cases because the plaintiffs failed to establish that Zolofit was capable of causing their injuries.

Defense of Class Action Alleging Fuel Oil Fraud — Case Dismissed at the Pleading Stage.

We represented Trafigura, one of the world's largest commodity trading companies, in a major class action lawsuit alleging a massive fuel oil fraud. The lawsuit, filed in U.S. District Court in Puerto Rico, alleged that officials at Puerto Rico's government-owned power utility, Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (PREPA), had accepted bribes and kickbacks from fuel oil suppliers in exchange for PREPA's agreement to accept and pay for millions of barrels of fuel oil that did not meet contract specifications. We obtained a dismissal at the pleading stage.

Brite Smart v. Google — Stay of Proceedings, Transfer and Dismissal

We recently obtained dismissal of all claims brought by Brite Smart Corp. against client Google. Brite Smart filed suit in the Eastern District of Texas accusing Google of infringing four patents allegedly directed at solving the problem of "click fraud." After taking over the case from predecessor counsel, we aggressively pursued discovery, identified prior art references, and uncovered evidence of inequitable conduct during the prosecution of the patents-in-suit. This resulted in substantially narrowing the case. We then obtained an unprecedented order from the Federal Circuit, staying all proceedings and directing the district court to rule on our motion to transfer. Following transfer to the Northern District of California, Brite Smart's attorneys withdrew from the litigation and we obtained a dismissal of all claims for failure to prosecute.

Defense of Patent Claims by 3M and Antitrust Claims Against 3M — Jury Verdict that 3M's patents invalid and \$26 Million Judgment against 3M for Antitrust Damages

We represented TransWeb in the defense of patent infringement claims asserted by 3M and the pursuit of antitrust claims against 3M. After a two-and-half-week trial, we obtained a unanimous jury verdict that 3M's asserted patent claims were invalid, not infringed, and (in an advisory ruling by the jury, the patents were unenforceable due to inequitable conduct). The jury also found that 3M violated the antitrust laws by attempting to enforce fraudulently obtained patents and awarded our client lost profits and attorneys' fees as antitrust damages, resulting in an approximately \$26 million judgment. Subsequently the Federal Circuit unanimously affirmed the judgments, including the award of trebled attorneys' fees as antitrust damages.