

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AUTOSTORE SYSTEM INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

OCADO INNOVATION LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00673
Patent 10,961,051

Before HUBERT C. LORIN, JON B. TORNQUIST, and
RICHARD H. MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

TERMINATION
Due to Settlement After Institution of Trial
35 U.S.C. § 317; 37 C.F.R. § 42.74

I. INTRODUCTION

With the Board’s authorization, Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively referred to as “the parties”) filed a Joint Motion to Terminate the above-identified proceeding due to settlement. Paper 42 (“Joint Motion”). In support of the Joint Motion, the parties filed a Confidential Settlement and License Agreement (Ex. 1026 (“Settlement Agreement”)), as well as a Joint Request to Treat the Settlement Agreement as Business Confidential Information (Paper 43 (“Joint Request”)) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74.

II. DISCUSSION

In the Joint Motion, the parties represent that they have reached an agreement to jointly seek termination of this *inter partes* review proceeding, and that the filed copy of the Settlement Agreement is a true copy. Joint Motion 1, 3. The parties further represent that their settlement agreement resolves all currently pending proceedings between the parties involving U.S. Patent No. 10,961,051. *Id.* at 2.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 317(a), “[a]n *inter partes* review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed.” Section 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) also provides that if no petitioner remains in the *inter partes* review, the Office may terminate the review.

We instituted a trial on the above-identified proceeding on September 14, 2022. Paper 7. We have not yet decided the merits of the proceeding, and a final written decision has not been entered. Notwithstanding that the proceeding has moved beyond the preliminary

stage, the parties have shown adequately that the termination of the proceeding is appropriate. Under these circumstances, we determine that good cause exists to terminate the proceeding with respect to the parties.

We also determine that the Settlement Agreement contains confidential business information regarding the terms of settlement, and therefore determine that good cause exists to treat the Settlement Agreement between Petitioner and Patent Owner as business confidential information pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

This Order does not constitute a final written decision pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a).

III. ORDER

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is:

ORDERED that the Joint Motion to Terminate (Paper 42) is *granted*, and IPR2022-00673 is *terminated* pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Request (Paper 43) to Treat the Settlement Agreement (Exhibit 1026) as Business Confidential Information is *granted*, and the Settlement Agreement shall be kept separate from the file of U.S. Patent No. 10,961,051, 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).

IPR2022-00673
Patent 10,961,051

PETITIONER:

W. Todd Baker
Joseph A. Loy
Aaron D. Resetarits
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
todd.baker@kirkland.com
jloy@kirkland.com
aaron.resetarits@kirkland.com

PATENT OWNER:

Stephen Elliott
Raffaele DeMarco
SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP
elliotts@sullcrom.com
demarcor@sullcrom.com