**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
**FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**
**WACO DIVISION**

| | |
|---|---|
| ALIGN TECHNOLOGY LLC,<br>Plaintiff,<br><br>*v.*<br><br>CLEARCORRECT OPERATING, LLC, CLEARCORRECT HOLDINGS, INC., INSTITUT STRAUMANN AG, AND STRAUMANN USA, LLC,<br>Defendants. | **CIVIL NO. 6:24-CV-00187-ADA-DTG** |
| CLEARCORRECT OPERATING, LLC, CLEARCORRECT HOLDINGS, INC., INSTITUT STRAUMANN AG, AND STRAUMANN USA, LLC,<br>Counterclaim-Plaintiffs,<br><br>*v.*<br><br>ALIGN TECHNOLOGY LLC,<br>Counterclaim-Defendant. | |

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Align Technology LLC's ("Align") Objections to the Magistrate Judge's June 17, 2025 Order. ECF No. 192. Align timely objects to the portion of the Magistrate Judge's order (ECF No. 190) concerning Align's production of customer contracts, arguing that the Court instead should order Align to conduct a reasonable search for responsive contracts and specify that Align need not produce duplicate copies of standard-form agreements for which it produces the terms and conditions. *See generally* ECF No. 192.

The Court must consider Align's objections and modify or set aside any part of the Magistrate Judge's order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). The clearly erroneous or contrary to law standard of review is "highly deferential" and requires the Court

to affirm the decision of the Magistrate Judge unless, based on the entire evidence, the Court reaches "a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." *Gomez v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 5:15-CV-866-DAE, 2017 WL 5201797, at *2 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 27, 2017) (quoting *United States v. United States Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948)). The clearly erroneous standard "does not entitle the Court to reverse or reconsider the order simply because it would or could decide the matter differently." *Id.* (citing *Guzman v. Hacienda Records & Recording Studio, Inc.*, 808 F.3d 1031, 1036 (5th Cir. 2015)). Upon its own review, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge's order was not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. The Court therefore **OVERRULES** Align's Objections (ECF No. 192) and **AFFIRMS** the Magistrate Judge's order (ECF No. 190).

**SIGNED** this 8th day of July, 2025.

ALAN D ALBRIGHT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE