

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**ORACLE CORPORATION**  
Petitioner,

v.

**COMMUNITY UNITED IP, LLC**  
Patent Owner.

---

Case CBM2013-00015 (JL)  
Patent 5,862,223

---

Before JAMESON LEE, JONI Y. CHANG, and MICHAEL W. KIM,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

LEE, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

JUDGMENT  
Termination of Proceeding  
37 C.F.R. § 42.73

On July 23, 2013, the parties filed a joint motion to terminate this proceeding with respect to the petitioner (“Oracle”). (Paper 10.) With the joint motion, the parties filed a copy of their written settlement agreement covering Patent 5,862,223 involved in this proceeding. (Ex. 1046.) The parties also filed,

on July 23, 2013, a joint request to have their settlement agreement treated as confidential business information under 35 U.S.C. § 327(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). (Paper 12.)

In a telephone conference call conducted on July 15, 2013, counsel for the parties represented that they have reached an agreement resolving the dispute in the instant proceeding, and will also move to dismiss related district court litigation between the parties involving Patent 5,862,223. The Board asked the parties to indicate in their joint motion to terminate this proceeding whether there will be codefendants remaining in such related litigation. The joint motion indicates none. The joint motion also identifies two other related litigations involving Patent 5,862,223, and indicates that both cases were terminated with respect to all defendants.

Generally, the Board expects that a proceeding will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement. *See, e.g., Office Patent Trial Practice Guide*, 77 *Fed. Reg.* 48756, 48768 (Aug. 14, 2012). Oracle's petition was filed on April 2, 2013, and Community United has not yet filed its Preliminary Response. The Board has not yet determined whether a covered business method patent review should be instituted.

Oracle represents that it will no longer participate, even if the Board institutes a covered business method patent review and commences a trial. That means even if a covered business method patent review is instituted, Oracle will not file a reply to any Patent Owner Response or an opposition to any Motion to Amend Claims. Oracle also will not be conducting any cross examination of Community United's witnesses. Also, because of non-participation of Oracle,

Community United may not have an opportunity to cross examine Oracle's witnesses whose testimony are relied on by Oracle's petition.

As no trial has been instituted based on Oracle's petition, this proceeding is in the preliminary proceeding stage.<sup>1</sup> Based on the facts of this case, it is appropriate to enter judgment.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, it is

**ORDERED** that the joint motion to terminate CBM2013-00015 is GRANTED, and this proceeding is hereby terminated as to all parties including petitioner Oracle and patent owner Community United; and

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the parties's joint request to have their settlement agreement treated as business confidential information under the 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c) is also GRANTED.

---

<sup>1</sup> A preliminary proceeding begins with the filing of a petition for instituting a trial and ends with a written decision as to whether a trial will be instituted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.2.

<sup>2</sup> A judgment means a final written decision by the Board, or a termination of a proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.2.

CBM2013-00015  
Patent 5,862,223

For PETITIONER

Amy R. Lemyre, Esq.  
Joel R. Merkin, Esq  
Kirkland & Ellis LLP  
amy.lemyre@kirkland.com  
joel.merkin@kirkland.com

For PATENT OWNER

Tarek N. Fahmi  
Amy J. Embert  
Fahmi, Sellers & Embert  
tarek.fahmi@fseip.com  
amy.embert@fseip.com