IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MIDLAND/ODESSA DIVISION

DIGITALDOORS, INC.,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	**CASE NO. 7:25-CV-00107-DC-DTG**
PINNACLE BANK,	§	
Defendant,	§	

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER (DKT. NO. 28)

Before the Court is the defendant, Amarillo National Bank's Motion to Reconsider (Dkt. No. 28). The defendant argues that the undersigned's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 26) should be reconsidered because of a memorandum and order from a New York district court in a similar case. Dkt. No. 28 at 2 (citing Dkt. No. 28-1). That memorandum summarizes the plaintiff's arguments made in a different case against a different bank. *Id*. Having considered the motion, the undersigned finds that the New York memorandum and order does not change the conclusion that in the present case, the plaintiff has pleaded a plausible infringement claim. Therefore, the motion is **DENIED.**

SIGNED this 9th day of March, 2026.

DEREK T. GILLILAND
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE