

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

REIN TECH, INC.,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) C.A. No. 18-1683 (MN)
MUELLER SYSTEMS, LLC,)
Defendant.)

ORDER

At Wilmington, this 27th day of January 2026:

WHEREAS, on May 12, 2025, Defendant Mueller Systems, LLC filed a motion requesting sanctions for Plaintiff Rein Tech, Inc.’s violations of the Protective Order (D.I. 32) in this case, including seeking Defendant’s “fees and costs in addressing Rein Tech’s violations and bringing this motion” (D.I. 166) (“the Sanctions Motion”);

WHEREAS, on May 15, 2025, Plaintiff opposed the Sanctions Motion (D.I. 169), and on August 1, 2025, this Court held a hearing with counsel for both parties and Michael Klicpera, the founder and owner of Plaintiff, on the Sanctions Motion (D.I. 196) (“the Sanctions Hearing”);

WHEREAS, at the Sanctions Hearing, this Court determined that Plaintiff had committed “multiple violations” of the Protective Order through, among other things, Mr. Klicpera’s “longstanding and continuous” access to discovery material that Defendant had designated confidential and prosecution of related patent applications after receiving such confidential material (D.I. 196 at 43:3-44:14);

WHEREAS, this Court issued appropriate sanctions for these violations and allowed Defendant “an opportunity to present to [the Court] what it believes is a reasonable request for fees and costs” (*Id.* at 47:17-19);

WHEREAS, on October 1, 2025, Defendant filed an application for attorneys' fees and costs totaling \$38,614.87 (D.I. 200; D.I. 201) ("the Fees Motion");

WHEREAS, on October 24, 2025, Plaintiff filed its opposition to the Fees Motion (D.I. 206) ("Opposition"); on October 30, 2025, Defendant filed its reply (D.I. 211); and on November 5, 2025, the Fees Motion was discussed briefly during a hearing before this Court;

WHEREAS, "[t]he party seeking attorney's fees has the burden to prove that its request for attorney's fees is reasonable" and "submit evidence supporting the hours worked and rates claimed" *Rode v. Dellarciprete*, 892 F.2d 1177, 1183 (3d Cir. 1990) (citation omitted);

WHEREAS, this Court has evaluated all briefing concerning the Fees Motion, including Plaintiff's Opposition and Defendant's submission of time entries and expenses;

WHEREAS, this Court finds that Defendant's requested fees are largely reasonable and that the arguments raised in Plaintiff's Opposition are largely unpersuasive;

WHEREAS, however, Plaintiff identifies that two of Defendant's counsel's time entries – for 10.3 hours on July 9, 2025 and 9.3 hours on July 10, 2025, billed for a combined total of \$6,468.00 (D.I. 201, Ex. A at 3) – which appear to include non-working¹ travel time to and from a hearing; and

WHEREAS, Defendant has not argued that it may recover fees for non-working travel time, and this Court will not bill Plaintiff for these entries.

¹ Defendant contends that these time entries "reflect time spent working in preparation for the hearing, not simply travel time." (D.I. 211 at 2). Yet this is not apparent from the entries. For example, Defendant's counsel bills 9.3 hours to "attend hearing related to violations of protective order and return travel from Delaware." (D.I. 201, Ex. A at 3). That hearing lasted approximately 1.5 hours (D.I. 193), and the time entry does not identify any work performed during travel.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendant's Fees Motion (D.I. 200) is GRANTED-IN-PART and DENIED-IN PART.
2. Plaintiff shall pay Defendant \$32,146.87 within thirty (30) days of this Order.

Maryellen Noreika
The Honorable Maryellen Noreika
United States District Judge