

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZTE (USA), Inc.,
Petitioner

v.

PRAGMATUS MOBILE LLC
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00670
Patent 8,466,795

Mailed: August 11, 2014

Before JAMES P. CALVE, GLENN J. PERRY, and PATRICK R.
SCANLON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PERRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*

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

The parties have requested that these trial proceedings be terminated pursuant to a settlement. On August 5, 2014, the Board authorized (Paper 8) the parties to file a Joint Motion to Terminate this proceeding along with a true copy of any and all settlement agreements between them related to the patent at issue. On August 8, 2014, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Terminate (Paper 9) in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 327(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72. The parties also filed a Joint Motion to Treat the Parties' Settlement Agreement as Business Confidential pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and Rule 42.74 (Paper 10). The settlement agreement (Paper 11), marked "Confidential," purports to settle matters between the parties with respect to the patent at issue in this *inter partes* review.

This *inter partes* review is in its preliminary stage. A decision on the Corrected Petition (Paper 4) has not yet been rendered. The parties have not identified any other USPTO proceedings related to the patent at issue. Under these circumstances, the Board determines that it is appropriate to enter judgment¹ and terminate the trial without rendering a final written decision under 37 C.F.R. § 42.72.

¹ A judgment means a final written decision by the Board or a termination of a proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.2.

ORDER

It is, therefore,

ORDERED that the joint motion to terminate this proceeding is GRANTED and the proceeding is hereby terminated; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' joint request that the settlement agreement be treated as business confidential information and kept separate from the file of the involved patent under the provisions of to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c), is GRANTED.

FOR PETITIONER:

Steven A. Moore
Richard W. Thill
PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP
steve.moore@pillsburylaw.com
richard.thill@pillsburylaw.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

David A. Caine
Vinh Pham
Agility IP Law, LLP
dacaine@agilityiplaw.com
vpham@agilityiplaw.com