

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Carbon Autonomous Robotic Systems Inc. v. Laudando & Associates
LLC

Carbon Autonomous Robotic Systems · No. 2:24-cv-03012-DAD-JDP · Decided June 13, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California grants Carbon Autonomous Robotic Systems Inc.’s motion for a preliminary injunction against Laudando & Associates LLC in a patent infringement action. The court concludes that plaintiff is likely to prove infringement of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 12,240,372 by the defendant’s L&Aser Module configured with AgCeption software. The order also addresses defense counsel’s renewed motion to withdraw.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dale A. Drozd
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	June 13, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-03012-DAD-JDP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought a preliminary injunction in a patent-infringement action, and defense counsel renewed a motion to withdraw. The court held a hearing and granted both motions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A preliminary injunction requires a showing of likely success on the merits, likely irreparable harm absent relief, a balance of equities favoring the movant, and consistency with the public interest. The movant bears the burden on each element. At the preliminary-injunction stage, the accused infringer bears the burden of presenting evidence supporting invalidity, while the patentee bears the ultimate burden of showing that the patent is not invalid.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district-court interlocutory order; precedential status is not stated in the opinion.

TOPICS

patent infringement

injunctions

intellectual property

equitable relief

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

patent law

patent infringement

preliminary injunctions

patent eligibility

attorney withdrawal

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff demonstrated a likelihood of success in proving that the accused product infringes claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 12,240,372.
2. Whether defendant raised a substantial question that claim 1 of the '372 patent is invalid for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102.
3. Whether claim 1 of the '372 patent is directed to patent-ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101.
4. Whether plaintiff established likely irreparable harm, a favorable balance of equities, and a public interest supporting a preliminary injunction.
5. Whether defense counsel demonstrated good cause to withdraw from representing the corporate defendant.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff demonstrated that it will likely prove that the accused product practices every element of claim 1 of the '372 patent and therefore will likely prove infringement.
2. Plaintiff showed that defendant was unlikely to establish by clear and convincing evidence at trial that claim 1 of the '372 patent was anticipated by the Nadimi paper.
3. Claim 1 of the '372 patent was not shown to be directed to an abstract idea and was therefore likely patent-eligible on the record before the court.
4. Plaintiff satisfied the requirements for a preliminary injunction because it showed likely success on the merits, likely irreparable harm, a balance of equities favoring relief, and a public interest at least slightly favoring enforcement of valid patent rights.
5. Defense counsel demonstrated good cause to withdraw because the corporate defendant materially breached its fee agreement, consented to withdrawal, and was warned of the consequences of proceeding without counsel.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The proper legal standard for preliminary injunctive relief requires a party to demonstrate ‘that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.’” (at 4)

“A patent is invalid for anticipation if a single prior art reference discloses each and every limitation of the claimed invention.” (at 18)

“corporations and other entities may appear only through an attorney; an unrepresented entity cannot file any pleadings, make or oppose any motions, or present any evidence to contest liability.” (at 33)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Carbon developed and sold LaserWeeder systems using cameras, computer-vision software, lighting, and lasers to identify and destroy weeds. Laudando announced a competing laser-based weeding product called the L&Aser Module, configured with AgCception software, which had not yet shipped but was being prepared for launch. Plaintiff's expert concluded from photographs, promotional materials, specifications, and related materials that the accused product practiced every limitation of claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 12,240,372. The court also relied on evidence that the relevant market was a two-player market and that defendant was in a precarious financial position.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Carbon Autonomous Robotic Systems Inc. filed a patent-infringement action against Laudando & Associates LLC concerning the L&Aser Module configured with AgCception software. Plaintiff moved for a preliminary injunction on April 8, 2025; defendant opposed, and plaintiff replied. After a May 20, 2025 hearing, the court granted the injunction, declined to require a bond, and granted defense counsel's renewed motion to withdraw subject to compliance with a sealing order and related conditions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky, 586 F.3d 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20, 22 (2008)
- All. for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131, 1134–35 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Klein v. City of San Clemente, 584 F.3d 1196, 1201 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Caribbean Marine Services Co. v. Baldrige, 844 F.2d 668, 674 (9th Cir. 1988)
- Maxwell Technologies v. Nesscap, Inc., 508 F. Supp. 2d 837, 842–43 (S.D. Cal. 2007)
- Omega Engineering, Inc. v. Raytek Corp., 334 F.3d 1314, 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2003)
- Phillips v. AWH Corp., 415 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
- Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., 877 F. Supp. 2d 838, 857–58, 866, 871–72 (N.D. Cal. 2012), rev'd on other grounds, 695 F.3d 1370 (Fed. Cir. 2012)
- AstraZeneca LP v. Apotex, Inc., 633 F.3d 1042, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 2011)
- Pavemetrics Systems v. Tetra Tech, Inc., No. 2:21-cv-01289-MCS-MAA, 2021 WL 2548959, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 15, 2021)
- Open Text, S.A. v. Box, Inc., 36 F. Supp. 3d 885, 891–92, 906, 908 (N.D. Cal. 2014)
- Titan Tire Corp. v. Case New Holland, Inc., 566 F.3d 1372, 1376–79 (Fed. Cir. 2009)
- Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc., 239 F.3d 1343, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
- QBAS Co. v. C Walters Intercoastal Corp., No. 10-cv-00406-AG-MLG, 2010 WL 7785955, at *6, *13–14 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2010)

- Biomedical Device Consultants & Laboratories of Colorado, LLC v. Vivitro Laboratories, Inc., 689 F. Supp. 3d 749, 754 (C.D. Cal. 2023), *aff'd*, No. 2023-2393, 2024 WL 1318251 (Fed. Cir. Mar. 28, 2024)
- Rosen Entertainment Systems, LP v. Eiger Vision, 343 F. Supp. 2d 908, 914 (C.D. Cal. 2004)
- FutureLogic, Inc. v. TransAct Technologies, No. 05-cv-03754-MMM-CT, 2008 WL 11400763, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2008)
- Ameranth, Inc. v. Papa John's USA, Inc., 946 F. Supp. 2d 1049, 1058 (S.D. Cal. 2013)
- Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals, 339 F.3d 1373, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2003)
- 3M Unitek Corp. v. Ormco Co., 96 F. Supp. 2d 1042, 1046 (C.D. Cal. 2000)
- Glaxo, Inc. v. Novopharm, Ltd., 52 F.3d 1043, 1047 (Fed. Cir. 1995)
- Radware, Ltd. v. F5 Networks, Inc., 147 F. Supp. 3d 974, 992–93 (N.D. Cal. 2015)
- Volterra Semiconductor Corp. v. Primarion, Inc., 796 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1060, 1062 (N.D. Cal. 2011)
- FairWarning IP, LLC v. Iatric Systems, Inc., 839 F.3d 1089, 1093 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
- Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 569 U.S. 576, 589 (2013)
- Rearden LLC v. TWDC Enterprises 18 Corp., No. 22-cv-02464-JST, 2023 WL 3579324, at *4–5 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 21, 2023)
- CardioNet, LLC v. InfoBionic, Inc., 955 F.3d 1358, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2020)
- CyberSource Corp. v. Retail Decisions, Inc., 654 F.3d 1366, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2011)
- Electronic Power Group v. Alstom S.A., 830 F.3d 1350, 1353–56 (Fed. Cir. 2016)
- Bascom Research, LLC v. LinkedIn, Inc., 77 F. Supp. 3d 940, 949–50 (N.D. Cal. 2015)
- Language Technologies Inc. v. Microsoft Corp., 727 F. Supp. 3d 856, 865 (D. Ariz. 2024)
- International Business Machines Corp. v. Zillow Group, 549 F. Supp. 3d 1247, 1270–71 (W.D. Wash. 2021), *aff'd*, 50 F.4th 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2022)
- Immersion Corp. v. Fitbit, Inc., 313 F. Supp. 3d 1005, 1024 (N.D. Cal. 2018)
- POWERbahn, LLC v. Foundation Fitness LLC, No. 3:15-cv-00327-MMD-WGC, 2016 WL 4318978, at *3 (D. Nev. Aug. 11, 2016)
- Polaris Innovations Ltd. v. Kingston Technology Co., 223 F. Supp. 3d 1026, 1033–34 (C.D. Cal. 2016)
- Baxter International, Inc. v. CareFusion Corp., No. 15-cv-09986-AJSE, 2016 WL 2770787, at *12 (N.D. Ill. May 13, 2016)
- SEMICAPS Pte Ltd. v. Hamamatsu Corp., 393 F. Supp. 3d 802, 815–17 (N.D. Cal. 2019)
- eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C., 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006)
- E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Biden, 993 F.3d 640, 677 (9th Cir. 2021)
- L.A. Memorial Coliseum Commission v. National Football League, 634 F.2d 1197, 1202 (9th Cir. 1980)
- Sampson v. Murray, 415 U.S. 61, 90 (1974)
- Goldie's Bookstore, Inc. v. Superior Court of the State of California, 739 F.2d 466, 472 (9th Cir. 1984)
- Midgett v. Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon, 254 F.3d 846, 850–51 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Presidio Components, Inc. v. American Technical Ceramics Corp., 702 F.3d 1351, 1363 (Fed. Cir. 2012)
- Conceptus, Inc. v. Hologic, Inc., No. 09-cv-02280-WHA, 2012 WL 44064, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2012)

- DMF, Inc. v. AMP Plus, Inc., No. 2:18-cv-07090-CAS-GJS, 2019 WL 1099982, at *12, *14 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 7, 2019)
- Automated Merchandising Systems, Inc. v. Crane Co., 357 F. App'x 297, 301 (Fed. Cir. 2009)
- Tee Turtle, LLC v. Kellytoy Worldwide, Inc., 522 F. Supp. 3d 695, 724–26 nn.8 (C.D. Cal. 2021)
- Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., No. 11-cv-01846-LHK, 2011 WL 7036077, at *29 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2011), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part, remanded*, 678 F.3d 1314 (Fed. Cir. 2012)
- Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Products Co., 717 F.3d 1336, 1344–45 (Fed. Cir. 2013)
- Merial Ltd. v. Cipla Ltd., 681 F.3d 1283, 1306 (Fed. Cir. 2012)
- Trebro Manufacturing, Inc. v. Firefly Equipment, LLC, 748 F.3d 1159, 1170–71 (Fed. Cir. 2014)
- 10X Genomics, Inc. v. Bruker Spatial Biology, Inc., No. 21-cv-00653-MFK, 2024 WL 5201115, at *15 (D. Del. Dec. 23, 2024)
- Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc. v. 10X Genomics Inc., 967 F.3d 1353, 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2020)
- Incyte Corp. v. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, 135 F.4th 1381, 1383–84 (Fed. Cir. 2025)
- Gonza LLC v. Mission Competition Fitness Equipment, LLC, No. 21-cv-00771-ADA, 2021 WL 5657193, at *7 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 1, 2021)
- Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Boehringer Ingelheim GMBH, 237 F.3d 1359, 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2001)
- Windsurfing International Inc. v. AMF, Inc., 782 F.2d 995, 1003 n.12 (Fed. Cir. 1986)
- Blackberry Ltd. v. Typo Products LLC, No. 14-cv-00023-WHO, 2014 WL 1318689, at *12 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 28, 2014)
- Hybritech Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories, 849 F.2d 1446, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1988)
- Johnson v. Couturier, 572 F.3d 1067, 1086 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Jorgensen v. Cassidy, 320 F.3d 906, 919 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Zest Anchors, LLC v. Geryon Ventures, LLC, 615 F. Supp. 3d 1206 (S.D. Cal. 2022), *rev'd in part*, No. 22-55704, 2023 WL 2783175 (9th Cir. Apr. 5, 2023)
- Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. v. New Images of Beverly Hills, 321 F.3d 878, 883 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Beard v. Shuttermart of California, Inc., No. 3:07-cv-00594-WQH-NLS, 2008 WL 410694, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 13, 2008)
- Caveman Foods, LLC v. jAnn Payne's Caveman Foods, LLC, No. 2:12-cv-01112-WBS-CKD, 2015 WL 6736801, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2015)
- Rowland v. California Men's Colony, 506 U.S. 194, 202 (1993)
- Shepard v. Kelso, No. 2:20-cv-01445-KJM-JDP (PC), 2023 WL 7308416, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2023)
- Chapman v. Ramada Inn, Vallejo, No. 2:16-02415-KJM-DB, 2019 WL 13258030, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2019)