

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING**

ABC IP, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, and RARE BREED TRIGGERS, INC., a Texas corporation,) Case No. 2:26-cv-00018
(
(
(
(
Plaintiffs,) **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**
(
(
v.)
(
PEAK TACTICAL, LLC d/b/a PARTISAN)
TRIGGERS, a Wyoming limited liability)
company, and NICHOLAS NORTON, an)
individual,)
(
Defendants.)

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs ABC IP, LLC and Rare Breed Triggers, Inc.’s Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) and Preliminary Injunction. Having considered the motion, supporting evidence, and applicable law, this Court **GRANTS** Plaintiffs’ Motion.

There is good cause to believe that the Defendants have: (1) engaged in, and continue to engage in, acts that violate Plaintiffs' asserted patent rights; and (2) made false representations in public commercial advertising regarding the design and nature of its accused product. Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on the merits; that it is likely Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable harm if this Order is not granted; that the probable harm to the Plaintiffs, if relief is not granted, outweighs the likely hardship that may result to Defendants from this Order; and that this Order is not adverse to the public interest.

It is therefore ORDERED that Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and any other person(s) in concert or participation with any of the foregoing people or entities are enjoined from the following conduct for the duration of this case:

1. making, using, offering to sell, selling, or importing the accused Partisan Disruptor product, or any substantially identical product;
2. stating publicly in commercial advertising that the Partisan Disruptor product is an assisted reset trigger; and
3. stating publicly in commercial advertising that the Partisan Disruptor product practices U.S. Patent No. 9,146,067.

It is further ORDERED that, because there has been an absence of proof showing a likelihood of harm to Defendants, Plaintiffs are not required to post security under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c).

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2026.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE