UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ATRIUS DEVELOPMENT GROUP CORP.,
Petitioner

v.

ABC IP LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-01473
U.S. Patent No. 12,038,247

DECLARATION OF LAWRENCE DEMONICO

I, Lawrence DeMonico, declare as follows:

1. My name is Lawrence DeMonico. I am over the age of twenty-one years and am otherwise qualified to testify in the above-referenced proceeding. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this Declaration and, if called and sworn as a witness, I would competently testify as to those facts.

2. I am the President of Rare Breed Triggers, Inc. ("RBT"). I have been in this role since December 10, 2020.

3. RBT is an American firearms trigger company headquartered in Texas.

4. RBT is the exclusive licensee of a portfolio of U.S. patents owned by ABC IP, LLC ("ABC") covering forced reset trigger ("FRT") technology. This portfolio includes U.S. Patent Nos. 7,398,723; 9,568,264; 9,816,772; 9,939,221; 10,502,511; 10,514,223; 11,002,500; 11,346,627; 11,629,923; 11,724,003; 12,031,784; 12,036,336; 12,038,247 ("the '247 patent"); 12,169,105; and 12,274,807, issued between 2008 and 2025. Only FRTs sold by RBT may legally incorporate these patented technologies, which differentiates RBT in the market.

5. The legality of FRT technology has been the subject of extensive litigation between 2021 and 2025, stemming from a finding by the United States Department of Justice's ("DOJ") Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives ("ATF") that RBT's FRT-15® product qualified as a "machinegun" as defined in 26 U.S.C. § 5845(b) and 18 U.S.C. § 921(a)(23).

6. Thereafter, RBT engaged in a series of lawsuits against the United States government to establish a legal market for RBT's products covered by ABC's patents, including the '247 patent. These include:

a. *Rare Breed Triggers LLC et al. v. Garland*, 6:21-cv-01245 (M.D. Fla.), initiated August 2, 2021 (dismissed October 28, 2021).

b. *Rare Breed Triggers LLC v. Garland*, 3:22-cv-00085 (D. N.D.), initiated May 16, 2022 (dismissed November 4, 2022).

c. *United States v. Rare Breed Triggers, LLC et al.*, 1:23-cv-00369 (E.D.N.Y.), initiated January 19, 2023.

d. *United States v. Miscellaneous Firearms and Related Parts and Equipment Listed in Exhibit A & Rare Breed Triggers*, 1:23-cv-00017 (D. Utah), initiated February 13, 2023.

e. *National Association for Gun Rights, Inc. et al. v. Garland*, 4:23-cv-00830 (N.D. Tex.), initiated August 9, 2023.

7. This multi-year campaign to ensure a lawful market for RBT's FRTs protected by ABC's patents, including the '247 patent, required an

extraordinary investment of time and resources. Over this period RBT, litigated in multiple districts; RBT and ABC dedicated over $3.25 million in legal fees and associated expenses to support its position; and RBT and ABC paid additional expenses associated with the defense of RBT's customers against allegations of criminal liability. Moreover, RBT and ABC expended even more funds to enforce ABC's patents against infringing entities.

8. Additionally, I—individually and on behalf of RBT—devoted thousands of hours to public messaging on the importance of this issue, fundraising, and lobbying to ensure a lawful market for RBT's FRTs protected by ABC's patents, including the '247 patent. I spent significant time on Capitol Hill lobbying lawmakers to support this cause. I also travelled the country doing speeches, taking interviews, and doing podcasts to reach millions of viewers. This national travel to further our lobbying and public messaging efforts required further expense, funded by me personally or shared with ABC. In short, advancing these litigations and lobbying initiatives became my full-time effort during these years.

9. For example, in the Northern District of Texas lawsuit identified above, I worked closely with the National Association of Gun Rights ("NAGR") on behalf of RBT and ABC to finance, strategize, and

prosecute this suit. RBT and ABC substantially funded this litigation, spending over $950,000 over the course of the litigation.

10. RBT and ABC were extensively involved in all aspects of case strategy. For example, RBT and ABC identified and paid the fees for the four expert witnesses—all former ATF experts—that were engaged for this litigation. I also personally developed strategy at each stage of the litigation, and drafted, reviewed, and revised each of NAGR's substantive filings in this case.

11. Apart from RBT and ABC, no company in the United States was willing to undertake this fight, in part given the required investment noted above and risks associated with creating this market.

12. RBT's investment in its multi-front litigation effort to secure this lawful market is partially reflected in an article by NRA-ILA, attached as Exhibit A, which summarized:

> A number of plaintiffs – including [RBT], various individuals, and the National Association for Gun Rights (NAGR) – sued various parties within DOJ, claiming its classification of FRTs was in violation of federal law.
>
> Meanwhile, ATF successfully moved for a preliminary injunction in the Eastern District of New York to prevent [RBT] from selling any FRTs and to require that it "preserve all documents" related to the receipt of such devices by its

> "customer base." [RBT] appealed that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.
>
> Nearly a year later, on July 23, 2024, a federal district judge in the Northern District of Texas vacated the ATF's "unlawful classification of FRTs as 'machineguns'" as "contrary to law" and "done in a manner beyond the scope of its legitimate statutory authority …." The government then appealed that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.
>
> The government had additionally petitioned the U.S. District Court for the District of Utah for forfeiture of FRTs and other property seized from [RBT] during its enforcement actions.

Ex. A.

13. This substantial investment paid off—after four years and countless court filings—in 2025. On May 13, 2025, RBT and I entered a Settlement Agreement with the United States and ATF. Ex. B. This agreement was reached after I personally travelled to Washington, D.C. and met with DOJ officials to negotiate the terms of this settlement. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the parties agreed to dismiss the Eastern District of New York, District of Utah, and Northern District of Texas lawsuits noted above. Ex. B ¶ 1.

14. Through this Settlement Agreement, and the years of investment and litigation that led to it, RBT and ABC have created a government-recognized and legal market for RBT's FRT technology covered by ABC's patents to which RBT is the exclusive licensee.

15. All exhibits cited herein are attached to this declaration.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. I understand that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

Executed this 10th day of November, 2025 in Austin, Texas.

Lawrence DeMonico
President, Rare Breed Triggers, Inc.

Exhibit A

APPEARS IN NEWS

Trump DOJ Settles Lawsuits Involving Forced Reset Triggers

MONDAY, MAY 19, 2025

SUPPORT NRA-ILA DONATE

On Friday, May 16, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) announced the settlement of several lawsuits arising from the Biden-Harris regime's attempt to reclassify forced reset triggers (FRTs) as "machineguns." DOJ's announcement cited President Trump's Executive Order *Protecting Second Amendment Rights* and the deliberations of the Attorney General's Second Amendment Task Force as the impetus behind the government's decision. The government also agreed to return seized FRTs, including from Rare Breed, a leading FRT manufacturer involved in the suits, and from Americans who had bought the triggers and surrendered them under allegations of illegal machinegun possession. FRTs will now likely return to the market, although the settlement contains terms that may limit their proliferation.

FRTs are aftermarket parts that forcibly reset the trigger of a semiautomatic firearm in which they are inserted to its forward position. In the hands of a skilled operator, they allow for a faster rate of fire than can typically be achieved with a conventional semiautomatic trigger. Importantly, however, they do not fundamentally alter the firing mechanism of the gun. The hammer must still be released from its sear surface for every round fired, and the trigger must still reset after each fired round.

Obtaining optimum performance and enhanced cyclic rates of fire with an FRT depend heavily on the operating principles of the gun itself, as well as on the operator's control of his trigger finger and shoulder weld. If the trigger is held fixed in its rearward position the firearm will malfunction.

Despite this and despite the federal statutory definition of a machinegun, which refers to a firearm that "shoots ... automatically more than one shot, without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger," ATF began reclassifying FRTs as machineguns in 2021. On March 22, 2022, the ATF issued an "Open Letter to All Federal Firearm Licensees" that warned of this posture. The ATF also launched civil and criminal enforcement actions against manufacturers, sellers, and even individual possessors of FRTs. ATF's seizures of the devices continued up to at least September 2023. In some cases, individual owners of the devices were contacted by ATF and urged to

RELATED


Trump Administration Cuts Off Funding Spigot to More Gun Control Groups


Trump DOJ Continues to Support the Second Amendment in the Courts


ATF Proposes Beneficial Changes to Form 1 for NFA Firearms


NRA-ILA Files Comments on DOJ's Relief from Disabilities Rulemaking


Federal Court Strikes Down Biden Administration's "Engaged in the Business" Rule in NRA Case

against manufacturers, sellers, and even individual possessors of FRTs. ATF's seizures of the devices continued up to at least September 2023. In some cases, individual owners of the devices were contacted by ATF and urged to "voluntarily" surrender them, on pain of possible felony prosecution for illegal possession of a machinegun.

A number of plaintiffs – including Rare Breed, various individuals, and the National Association for Gun Rights (NAGR) – sued various parties within DOJ, claiming its classification of FRTs was in violation of federal law.

Meanwhile, ATF successfully moved for a preliminary injunction in the Eastern District of New York to prevent Rare Breed from selling any FRTs and to require that it "preserve all documents" related to the receipt of such devices by its "customer base." The defendants' appealed that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Nearly a year later, on July 23, 2024, a federal district judge in the Northern District of Texas vacated the ATF's "unlawful classification of FRTs as 'machineguns'" as "contrary to law" and "done in a manner beyond the scope of its legitimate statutory authority ... ." The government then appealed that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

The government had additionally petitioned the U.S. District Court for the District of Utah for forfeiture of FRTs and other property seized from Rare Breed Triggers during its enforcement actions.

Significantly, however, no one at Rare Breed Triggers was ever criminally prosecuted for a federal machinegun offense.

In the midst of these proceedings, on June 14, 2024, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a ruling in *Garland v. Gargill*, holding that adding a bump stock to a semiautomatic firearm does not create a machinegun. Specifically, the Court wrote:

With or without a bump stock, a shooter must release and reset the trigger between every shot. And, any subsequent shot fired after the trigger has been released and reset is the result of a separate and distinct "function of the trigger." All that a bump stock does is accelerate the rate of fire by causing these distinct "function[s]" of the trigger to occur in rapid succession.

The agreement announced between DOJ, Rare Breed, NAGR, and the individual plaintiffs resolves all the above-mentioned cases. The appeals in the Second and Fifth Circuit will be dropped, and the government will dismiss its forfeiture case in the District of Utah and return Rare Breed's property. Additionally, "The United States agrees, to the extent practicable, to return FRTs ... that it has seized or taken as a result of a voluntary surrender." Such returns, however, "must be requested by individual owners by September 30, 2025, consistent with the instructions provided on ATF's public website."

Critically, the government agrees in the settlement,

not to enforce 18 U.S.C. § 922(o) and the requirements of the National Firearms Act, Gun Control Act of 1968 as amended by the Hughes Amendment to the 1986 Firearm Owners Protection Act, or any similar statute or agency interpretation of 26 U.S.C. § 5845(b) under which an FRT is contended to be a "machinegun" or otherwise unlawful against any person or organization for possessing or transferring FRTs ... .

But this concession is subject to two important qualifications. The first is that the FRT operates as described by the Northern District of Texas in its decision vacating ATF's classification of FRTs as machineguns. The second is that the FRT not be designed for use in a handgun, defined for purposes of the agreement as "a firearm whose magazine loads into the trigger-hand grip."

Rare Breed also agreed to certain conditions on its own continued business in FRTs. One is that "they will not develop or design FRTs for use in any handgun," as previously defined, nor "market, advertise, or encourage individuals to put FRT triggers on any handgun." Additionally, Rare Breed and its officers agree to "take all reasonable efforts" to seek prohibitory injunctions at the company's own expense under its FRT patent, provided they "have a good faith argument that the device is within the scope of the patent." Finally, Rare Breed consented "to promote the safe and responsible use of its devices including by displaying such material on its website and other online platforms."

The settlement clears the way for Rare Breed to continue manufacturing and selling FRTs that comply with the

other online platforms.

The settlement clears the way for Rare Breed to continue manufacturing and selling FRTs that comply with the agreement's terms. Other companies, however, may face barriers to entering the market during the pendency of Rare Breed's patent. Should their designs significantly deviate from that patent, however, the government apparently reserves the right to judge on a case-by-case basis whether the item would be considered a machinegun.

Somewhat cryptically, the government also reserved the right not to return FRTs "that are evidence in criminal investigations or prosecutions or are subject to forfeiture pursuant to 27 C.F.R. § 478.152." What this means, and how many such cases may be pending, is not clear. But it may draw a distinction between enforcement actions where mere possession, receipt, or transfer of the FRT is at issue versus those where a firearm equipped with an FRT was used in the commission of another offense.

Although the government appears in the agreement to establish a process for individuals whose FRTs were seized or surrendered under threat of prosecution to get them back, there are undoubtedly many more such individuals than those who are party to the agreement. ATF had notably already begun a process for members of the general public to get their FRTs back following the vacatur from the Northern District of Texas. Information regarding that process remains on the agency's website.

Whether ATF intends to enforce its September 30 deadline against such non-party individuals remains to be seen. But persons affected by ATF's unlawful classification may still have their own remedies, beyond those applicable to the parties in the cases resolved by the settlement.

It is important to note that nothing in the settlement disturbs the Northern District of Texas decision on the legality of ATF's classification. On the other hand, the agreement also states it is not "intended to create rights enforceable by persons other than Named Claimants as plaintiffs in civil litigation," so it doesn't guarantee success or the government's acquiescence in any such case.

Overall, the agreement appears to reasonably settle the outstanding civil cases on FRTs in a way that respects the rule of law and gives due deference to the fact that FRTs in the hands of law-abiding gun owners are not a per se threat to public safety. It doesn't necessarily resolve every question that may arise in this area, or in the area of accelerating devices generally, but it is certainly a welcome departure from the overreaching and excessively punitive approach of the Biden-Harris administration.

Rare Breed, in particular, is to be commended for its tenacious and principled defense of its products and of those who lawfully use them.

IN THIS ARTICLE

ATF BIDEN EXECUTIVE ORDERS FIFTH CIRCUIT DOJ

TRENDING NOW

NEWS MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2025

Trump Administration Cuts Off Funding Spigot to More Gun Control Groups

An NRA-ILA alert last month highlighted the ways in which President Donald Trump has used his office to safeguard our rights protected under the Second Amendment.

LEGAL & LEGISLATION FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2025

North Carolina: Update on Permitless Carry

Last week the North Carolina General Assembly briefly returned from recess and re-referred Senate Bill 50, Freedom to Carry NC, to the House

Last week the North Carolina General Assembly briefly returned from recess and re-referred Senate Bill 50, Freedom to Carry NC, to the House Rules Committee.

NEWS MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2025

ATF Proposes Beneficial Changes to Form 1 for NFA Firearms

After the nasty tricks of the Biden-Harris administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) continues to hand out treats under President Trump.

NEWS MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2025

Everytown Gun "Safety" Course: We Told Ya So

A few weeks ago, we mentioned that the anti-gun extremists at Everytown were ready to launch their own gun "safety" course.

LEGAL & LEGISLATION WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2025

Virginia: Election Results Threaten Your Second Amendment Rights

The recent election has brought significant changes to the electorate, and the results couldn't be clearer. An anti-gun majority now controls the House of Delegates, and an anti-gun Governor is preparing to take office. Together, they ...

MORE TRENDING +

NRAEXPLORE MORE LIKE THIS FROM AROUND THE NRA

DOJ ISSUES "RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES" PROPOSAL
An Official Journal Of The NRA

NRA LEADS LAWSUIT TO STRIKE DOWN NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL
An NRA Shooting Sports Journal

DOJ ISSUES "RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES" PROPOSAL
An Official Journal Of The NRA

NFA Firearms

After the nasty tricks of the Biden-Harris administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) continues to hand out treats under President Trump.

NEWS MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2025

Everytown Gun "Safety" Course: We Told Ya So

A few weeks ago, we mentioned that the anti-gun extremists at Everytown were ready to launch their own gun "safety" course.

LEGAL & LEGISLATION WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2025

Virginia: Election Results Threaten Your Second Amendment Rights

The recent election has brought significant changes to the electorate, and the results couldn't be clearer. An anti-gun majority now controls the House of Delegates, and an anti-gun Governor is preparing to take office. Together, they ...

MORE TRENDING +

NRAEXPLORE MORE LIKE THIS FROM AROUND THE NRA

DOJ ISSUES "RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES" PROPOSAL
An Official Journal Of The NRA

NRA LEADS LAWSUIT TO STRIKE DOWN NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL
An NRA Shooting Sports Journal

DOJ ISSUES "RELIEF FROM DISABILITIES" PROPOSAL
An Official Journal Of The NRA

Exhibit B

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") is made this 13th day of May, 2025, by and between the individuals and entities listed in Exhibit A ("Claimants") and the United States of America ("the United States"), acting by and through Pamela J. Bondi, in her official capacity as Attorney General of the United States and Daniel P. Driscoll, in his official capacity as Acting Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives ("ATF") (collectively, the "Parties"). The term "Named Claimants" shall mean: Rare Breed Triggers, LLC, also referred to as "RBT"; Rare Breed Firearms, LLC, also referred to as "RBF"; National Association for Gun Rights Inc.; Texas Gun Rights, Inc.; Patrick Carey; James Wheeler; Travis Speegle; Lawrence DeMonico; and Kevin Maxwell.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees that "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

WHEREAS, Congress amended the Gun Control Act of 1968 to prohibit, in most circumstances, the transfer, possession, and registration of new machineguns. 18 U.S.C. § 922(o)(1).

WHEREAS, The National Firearms Act of 1934 defines a "machinegun" as

> any weapon which shoots, is designed to shoot, or can be readily restored to shoot, automatically more than one shot, without manual reloading, by a single function of the trigger. The term shall also include the frame or receiver of any such weapon, any part designed and intended solely and exclusively, or combination of parts designed and intended, for use in converting a weapon into a machinegun, and any combination of parts from which a machinegun can be assembled if such parts are in the possession or under the control of a person.

26 U.S.C. § 5845(b).

WHEREAS, during the previous Administration, the ATF's Firearms Technology Criminal Branch ("FTCB") issued an "Open Letter to All Federal Firearms Licensees" advising that the ATF "recently examined devices commonly known as 'forced reset triggers' (FRTs) and has determined that *some* of them are 'firearms' and 'machineguns'" as defined by the federal law.

WHEREAS, against this backdrop, there is now pending a series of lawsuits described in Exhibit B (collectively, the "Litigation"), concerning the classification of FRTs and the conduct of Rare Breed Triggers LLC ("RBT"), Rare Breed Firearms LLC ("RBF"), and other Claimants.

WHEREAS, on February 7, 2025, President Trump issued an Executive Order titled "Protecting Second Amendment Rights." E.O. 14,206, 90 Fed. Reg. 9503 (Feb. 7, 2025). Among other things, this Order directed the Attorney General to review all actions of executive departments and agencies to assess their impact on the right to bear arms. *Id.* at Sec. 2. As part of implementing the President's Executive Order, the Attorney General on April 8 created the Second Amendment Task Force ("Task Force"), which is devoted to protecting the Second Amendment rights of all Americans. Upon review of these cases by the Task Force, the government believes that continuing the Litigation described in Exhibit B is not in the public interest.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the Recitals and mutual promises contained herein, including the discontinuation of the pending Litigation, and for other good and valuable consideration hereby deemed received, the Parties agree as follows:

TERMS OF AGREEMENT

1. The Parties agree to resolve outstanding litigation as follows:

   a. Within seven days of execution of this agreement, the parties will jointly move to dismiss with prejudice *United States v. Miscellaneous Firearms and Related Parts and Equipment Listed in Exhibit A,* No. 23-cv-17 (D. Utah), under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(ii).

   b. Within seven days of execution of this agreement, the United States will file a stipulation of dismissal in No. 23-cv-369 (E.D.N.Y) with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a), and within 2 business days of the above dismissal Appellants-Defendants, the Rare Breed Parties (RBT, RBF, DeMonico, and Maxwell) will dismiss their pending appeal in *United States v. Rare Breed Triggers LLC*, No. 23-cv-369 (E.D.N.Y), on appeal 23-7276 (2d Cir.) under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 42(b)(2) as moot.

   c. Within seven days of execution of this agreement, the United States will dismiss their pending appeal in *NAGR v. Bondi*, 23-cv-830-O (N.D. Tex.), on appeal 24-10707 (5th Cir.) under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 42(b)(2).

2. The Parties agree that, for purposes of litigation described in Exhibit B, each side shall bear its own costs and not seek attorneys' fees.

3. The United States agrees, to the extent practicable, to return FRTs (as defined in paragraph 11, below) that it has seized or taken as a result of a voluntary surrender. Such returns must be requested by individual owners by September 30, 2025, consistent with the instructions provided on ATF's public website. With respect to FRTs seized or surrendered in connection with the litigation described in Exhibit B, the return of the FRTs shall be in full settlement and

satisfaction of all claims to the FRTs and all claims and causes of action that could result from the FRTs' seizure and inclusion in the litigation described in Exhibit B. This paragraph does not apply to FRTs that are evidence in criminal investigations or prosecutions or are subject to forfeiture pursuant to 27 C.F.R. § 478.152.

4. The United States agrees to the prompt return of all bonds posted related to the litigations described in Exhibit B.

5. Each Named Claimant agrees to hold harmless and fully and finally release the United States, and all of its agencies, including, but not limited to, ATF, the United States Marshals Service, and any other involved federal, state and local authorities, and their agencies, agents, officers, employees and servants from any claims (whether known or unknown, including claims for attorney's fees and costs, interest, and expenses of every kind and however denominated) that Named Claimants or that Named Claimants' heirs, successors, transferees, or assignees have asserted, could have asserted, or may assert in the future against the United States, any of the above departments, or their agencies, agents, officers, and employees related to the seizure of the FRTs and the United States' investigation and inclusion of the FRTs in the Litigation described in Exhibit B.

6. Named Claimants waive all rights to file claims—constitutional, statutory, or otherwise—with respect to the seizure of the FRTs including any claim that the officers who seized the FRTs lacked probable cause for such seizure.

7. RBT, RBF, Mr. DeMonico, and Mr. Maxwell agree that they will not develop or design FRTs for use in any handgun. Handgun is defined, for the purposes of this agreement, as a firearm whose magazine loads into the trigger-hand grip.

8. RBT, RBF, Mr. DeMonico, and Mr. Maxwell will not market, advertise, or encourage individuals to put FRT triggers on any handgun.

9. RBT, RBF, Mr. DeMonico, and Mr. Maxwell agree to take all reasonable efforts to engage in patent enforcement seeking prohibitory injunctions against any person or entity that manufacturers, sells, or distributes any FRT during the life of U.S. Patent No. 10,514,223 patent, provided RBT, Mr. DeMonico, and Mr. Maxwell have a good faith argument that the device is within the scope of the patent. The United States will not bear litigation costs of any patent enforcement actions.

10. ATF agrees to process RBF's Federal Firearms License and will not deny the license based on the interpretation of FRTs being machineguns or the possession, sale, transfer, transport or manufacturing of FRTs.

11. The United States agrees not to enforce 18 U.S.C. § 922(o) and the requirements of the National Firearms Act, Gun Control Act of 1968 as amended by the Hughes Amendment to the 1986 Firearm Owners Protection Act, or any similar statute or agency interpretation of 26 U.S.C. § 5845(b) under which an FRT is contended to be a "machinegun" or otherwise unlawful against any person or organization for possessing or transferring FRTs under the following two conditions:

a. The FRTs have the mode of operation described in the District Court's opinion in *NAGR v. Garland*, 741 F. Supp. 3d 568, 580 (N.D. Tex. 2024), as follows: (1) the FRT is forcibly reset to its forward reset state after each round fired; (2) the FRT is locked mechanically in its reset state preventing the trigger from moving until the firearm is safe to fire; (3) the hammer must be released from its sear surface for every round fired; (4) the trigger in an FRT-equipped firearm must reset after every round fired; and (5) preventing the reset will cause the weapon to malfunction.

b. The FRTs are not designed for use in and used in handguns as defined above.

12. The United States agrees to hold harmless and fully and finally release the Claimants, all of their/its members, agents, officers, employees, transferees, assigns, designees and servants from any claims that the United States could have asserted, against the Claimants, their/its members, agents, officers, employees, transferees, assigns, designees, servants, or any of them, related to the manufacture, possession, sale, or ownership of any FRTs described in the preceding paragraph.

13. Each Named Claimant agrees to hold harmless and fully and finally release the United States, its agencies, components, agents, employees and former employees, both in their official and their individual capacities, and the United States from any and all claims, demands, and causes of actions of every kind, nature or description, whether for monetary or equitable relief, and whether currently known or unknown, that such Named Claimant may have had, may now have, or may hereafter have arising out of or in connection with actions or events related to the Litigation described in Exhibit B.

14. The United States agrees to consider filing statements in support of RBT's civil actions for injunctions against patent violators detailing the public interest to be served by the injunctions.

15. RBT agrees to promote the safe and responsible use of its devices including by displaying such material on its website and other online platforms.

16. Nothing in this Agreement is intended to create rights enforceable by persons other than Named Claimants as plaintiffs in civil litigation.

17. Nothing in this Agreement is intended to release or otherwise affect any claim or potential claim against any person who is a defendant in either Case No. 2022-CA-001715 or Case

No. 2022-CA-000533 in the Circuit Court the 18th Judicial Circuit, in and for Seminole County, Florida.

18. This Agreement is governed by the laws of the United States. The exclusive venue for any dispute relating to this Agreement is the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas. For purposes of construing this Agreement, this Agreement shall be deemed to have been drafted by all Parties to this Agreement and shall not, therefore, be construed against any Party for that reason in any subsequent dispute.

19. The Parties hereby warrant and represent that the terms of this agreement have been completely read, fully understood, and voluntarily accepted following opportunity for review by legal counsel of their choice. The Parties further warrant and represent that they are satisfied with their counsel, if any.

20. This written agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the Parties, and supersedes and replaces all prior negotiations and agreements, whether written or oral, regarding the litigation described in Exhibit B and any claim Claimants may have in such litigation.

21. No modification of this agreement is effective unless in writing and signed by all Parties.

22. All signatories represent that they have authority to enter into this Agreement on behalf of their respective clients.

23. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement is executed as of the date and year first indicated above.

ON BEHALF OF CLAIMANTS

Kevin Maxwell
Manager and Owner
Rare Breed Triggers, LLC

Lawrence DeMonico
President, Rare Breed Firearms, LLC

Hannah Hill
Vice President, National Association for Gun Rights Inc.

Chris McNutt
President, Texas Gun Rights, Inc.

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for Patrick Carey

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for James Wheeler

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for Travis Speegle

Lawrence DeMonico

Kevin C. Maxwell

ON BEHALF OF CLAIMANTS

Kevin Maxwell
Manager and Owner
Rare Breed Triggers, LLC

Lawrence DeMonico
President, Rare Breed Firearms, LLC

Hannah Hill
Vice President, National Association for Gun Rights Inc.

Chris McNutt
President, Texas Gun Rights, Inc.

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for Patrick Carey

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for James Wheeler

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for Travis Speegle

Lawrence DeMonico

Kevin C. Maxwell

ON BEHALF OF CLAIMANTS

Kevin Maxwell
Manager and Owner
Rare Breed Triggers, LLC

Lawrence DeMonico
President, Rare Breed Firearms, LLC

Hannah Hill
Vice President, National Association for Gun Rights Inc.

Chris McNutt
President, Texas Gun Rights, Inc.

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for Patrick Carey

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for James Wheeler

Jonathan M. Shaw
Counsel for Travis Speegle

Lawrence DeMonico

Kevin C. Maxwell

ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Yaakov M. Roth
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division
U.S. Department of Justice

Robert J. Leider
Chief Counsel
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives
U.S. Department of Justice

ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Yaakov M. Roth
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division
U.S. Department of Justice

Robert J. Leider
Chief Counsel
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives
U.S. Department of Justice

EXHIBIT A

For purposes of this Settlement Agreement, "Claimants" refers to the following organizations (including their members) and individuals, their subsidiaries, affiliates, successors, officers, and employees:

1. Rare Breed Triggers, LLC, also referred to as "RBT"
2. Rare Breed Firearms, LLC, also referred to as "RBF"
3. National Association for Gun Rights Inc.
4. Texas Gun Rights, Inc.
5. Patrick Carey
6. James Wheeler
7. Travis Speegle
8. Lawrence DeMonico
9. Kevin Maxwell

EXHIBIT B

For purposes of this Settlement Agreement, "Litigation" refers to the following cases and their appeals:

1. *NAGR v. Bondi*, 23-cv-830-O (N.D. Tex.), on appeal 24-10707 (5th Cir.).

2. *United States v. Rare Breed Triggers LLC*, No. 23-cv-369 (E.D.N.Y), on appeal 23-7276 (2d Cir.).

3. *United States v. Miscellaneous Firearms and Related Parts and Equipment Listed in Exhibit A,* No. 23-cv-17 (D. Utah).