

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY and  
CONSUMER LIGHTING (U.S.), LLC (d/b/a GE LIGHTING),  
Petitioner,

v.

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2020-01456 (Patent 7,781,789 B2)  
IPR2020-01457 (Patent 9,240,529 B2)  
IPR2020-01458 (Patent 9,859,464 B2)  
IPR2020-01459 (Patent 10,217,916 B2)

---

Before JENNIFER S. BISK, CHRISTOPHER L. CRUMBLEY, and  
STEVEN M. AMUNDSON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CRUMBLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*

DECISION  
Dismissal Prior to Institution of Trial  
*35 U.S.C. § 314*

IPR2020-01456 (Patent 7,781,789 B2)  
IPR2020-01457 (Patent 9,240,529 B2)  
IPR2020-01458 (Patent 9,859,464 B2)  
IPR2020-01459 (Patent 10,217,916 B2)

General Electric Company and Consumer Lighting (U.S.), LLC (d/b/a GE Lighting) (collectively, “GE”) filed four Petitions requesting *inter partes* reviews of various claims of patents owned by the Regents of the University of California (“Regents”). Paper 3.<sup>1</sup> GE subsequently contacted the Board via e-mail, requesting authorization to file unopposed motions to dismiss the four proceedings. We granted the requested authorization, and GE filed an Unopposed Motion to Dismiss Petition in each of the proceedings. Paper 8 (“Mot.”).

In the Motion, GE explains that, after it filed the Petitions, Regents named GE as Respondent in a complaint to the International Trade Commission alleging infringement of five patents, including U.S. Patent Nos. 9,240,529 (IPR2020-01457) and 9,859,464 (IPR2020-01458). Mot. 2. Because substantially similar issues will be addressed in the Board proceedings and before the ITC, Petitioner wishes to dismiss the four Petitions pending before the Board, “to avoid overlapping ITC and PTAB proceedings addressing substantially the same issues.” *Id.* Regents does not oppose GE’s request. *Id.*

These proceedings are at an early stage and we have not yet considered the merits of the Petitions, nor have we instituted any trial. In view of the early stage of these proceedings, we determine it is appropriate to dismiss the Petitions and terminate the proceedings to promote efficiency and minimize unnecessary costs. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(a).

---

<sup>1</sup> For brevity, citations herein are to the record in IPR2020-01456. Corresponding papers may be found in the records of the related cases.

IPR2020-01456 (Patent 7,781,789 B2)  
IPR2020-01457 (Patent 9,240,529 B2)  
IPR2020-01458 (Patent 9,859,464 B2)  
IPR2020-01459 (Patent 10,217,916 B2)

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the Unopposed Motions to Dismiss are *granted*;  
FURTHER ORDERED that the Petitions are *dismissed*;  
FURTHER ORDERED that these proceedings are *terminated*; and  
FURTHER ORDERED that this paper does not constitute a final  
written decision pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a).

IPR2020-01456 (Patent 7,781,789 B2)  
IPR2020-01457 (Patent 9,240,529 B2)  
IPR2020-01458 (Patent 9,859,464 B2)  
IPR2020-01459 (Patent 10,217,916 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Joseph Sauer  
[jmsauer@jonesday.com](mailto:jmsauer@jonesday.com)

Matthew Johnson  
[mwjohnson@jonesday.com](mailto:mwjohnson@jonesday.com)

David Cochran  
[dcochran@jonesday.com](mailto:dcochran@jonesday.com)

Robert M. Breetz  
[rbreetz@jonesday.com](mailto:rbreetz@jonesday.com)

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Peter Wied  
[pwied@nixonpeabody.com](mailto:pwied@nixonpeabody.com)

Vincent Yip  
[vyip@nixonpeabody.com](mailto:vyip@nixonpeabody.com)

Shawn Hansen  
[shansen@nixonpeabody.com](mailto:shansen@nixonpeabody.com)