

RETRACTABLE TECHNOLOGIES INC  
Form 8-K  
October 02, 2013

**UNITED STATES**  
**SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

Washington, D.C. 20549

**FORM 8-K**

**CURRENT REPORT**

**Pursuant to Section 13 OR 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934**

Date of Report (Date of earliest event reported) **September 30, 2013**

**Retractable Technologies, Inc.**

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

**Texas**  
(State or other jurisdiction  
of incorporation)

**001-16465**  
(Commission  
File Number)

**75-2599762**  
(IRS Employer  
Identification No.)

**511 Lobo Lane, Little Elm, Texas**  
(Address of principal executive offices)

**75068-0009**  
(Zip Code)

Registrant's telephone number, including area code **(972) 294-1010**

**None**

(Former name or former address, if changed since last report)

## Edgar Filing: RETRACTABLE TECHNOLOGIES INC - Form 8-K

Check the appropriate box below if the Form 8-K filing is intended to simultaneously satisfy the filing obligation of the registrant under any of the following provisions (see General Instruction A.2. below):

Written communications pursuant to Rule 425 under the Securities Act (17 CFR 230.425)

Soliciting material pursuant to Rule 14a-12 under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14a-12)

Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 14d-2(b) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.14d-2(b))

Pre-commencement communications pursuant to Rule 13e-4(c) under the Exchange Act (17 CFR 240.13e-4(c))

**Item 8.01 Other Events.**

On September 30, 2013, Retractable Technologies, Inc. (the Company) received payment of \$7,724,825.91 (the Judgment Amount) from Becton Dickinson and Company (BD) pursuant to a stipulation in the patent infringement case *Retractable Technologies, Inc. and Thomas Shaw v. Becton Dickinson and Company*, Civil Action No. 2:07-cv-250, in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division. The stipulation provides that if, as a result of BD's appeal of the District Court's denial of BD's Rule 60(B)(5) motion, it is judicially determined that BD owes an amount less than the Judgment Amount, BD shall be entitled to restitution by the Company of any excess payment, with interest. Otherwise, the payment of the Judgment Amount shall constitute satisfaction of the patent infringement judgment and BD shall owe no further money damages to the Company in the patent infringement case.

The Judgment Amount is related only to the patent infringement portion of the claims the Company filed against BD in 2007 alleging patent infringement and violations of the antitrust laws and Lanham Act. In 2008, the Court severed the patent claims from the other claims. On September 19, 2013, a verdict was entered confirming the Company's claims that BD illegally engaged in anticompetitive conduct with the intent to acquire or maintain monopoly power in the safety syringe market and engaged in false advertising under the Lanham Act. The jury awarded the Company \$113,508,014 in damages for the antitrust claim (which is subject to being trebled pursuant to federal statute). A final judgment in this matter has not been entered by the Court, pending resolution of post-trial motions. The Court has set a hearing for post-trial motions on December 12, 2013. BD has stated that it plans to appeal the verdict.

**SIGNATURES**

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the registrant has duly caused this report to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned hereunto duly authorized.

DATE: October 2, 2013

RETRACTABLE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
(Registrant)

BY: /s/ DOUGLAS W. COWAN  
DOUGLAS W. COWAN  
VICE PRESIDENT, CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER,  
AND CHIEF ACCOUNTING OFFICER