Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper 18
Entered: July 23, 2014

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BROADCOM CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

SIGNAL ENHANCEMENT TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00188 (Patent 7,493,097)
Case IPR2014-00189 (Patent 7,493,097)
Case IPR2014-00193 (Patent 6,785,530)[1]

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, and MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

EASTHOM, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

JUDGMENT
Termination of the Proceedings
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72, 42.73, 42.74

---

[1] This Judgment pertains to, and will be filed in, each of the three cases. The parties are not authorized to use this heading style.

On July 22, 2014, in each of the above-listed related proceedings, the parties filed a joint motion to terminate the respective proceeding, along with a true copy of their written settlement agreement (Ex. 2001) and a release (Ex. 2002), made in connection therewith, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b). Paper 16.[2] The parties also filed joint motions in each case to treat each settlement agreement and release as business confidential information under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). Paper 17.

In each case, the joint motion to terminate states that the parties jointly request termination of the respective proceeding and that termination is proper because the proceeding is at a preliminary stage. *See* Paper 16. As the motions note, we recently (April 25, 2014) instituted trial in each case. *Id*. At this preliminary stage in each proceeding, the record lacks full briefing on the trial issues.

The motions also indicate that the respective agreement requires dismissal of "the only litigation matter involving the challenged patents," a related district court lawsuit involving the parties and patents at issue. *Id*. The motions also indicate that there are no related proceedings currently at the USPTO, the parties have settled all disputes involving the two patents at issue, and the parties, in each case, have entered into a mutual release (Ex. 2002) pursuant to the settlement agreement

[2] Record citations refer to the representative IPR2014-00188 proceeding. The parties filed substantively similar motions, settlement agreements, and releases in the other two cases, IPR2014-00189 and IPR2014-00193. *See* IPR2014-00189, Papers 15, 16, Exs. 2001, 2002; IPR2014-00193, Papers 15, 16, Exs. 2002, 2003.

(Ex. 2001). *Id*.

Based on the foregoing, the record warrants entering judgment by terminating the proceeding without rendering a final written decision. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 317(a); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72 (termination), 42.73 (judgment generally), 42.74 (settlement). A judgment "means a final written decision by the Board, or a termination of a proceeding." 37 C.F.R. § 42.2.

It is

ORDERED that the joint motions to terminate IPR2014-00188, IPR2014-00189, and IPR2014-00193 are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that IPR2014-00188, IPR2014-00189, and IPR2014-00193 are *terminated;* and

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' joint requests in each case, IPR2014-00188, IPR2014-00189, and IPR2014-00193, that the respective settlement agreement and release be treated as business confidential information, kept separate from the patent files, and made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c), are *granted*.

FOR PETITIONER:

Dominic Massa
Michael Diener
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
dominic.massa@wilmerhale.com
michael.diener@wilmerhale.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Keith Rutherford
James Hall
Wong Cabello Lutsch Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
SETIPR@counselip.com
jhall@counselip.com