

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

NOKIA OF AMERICA CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

ALEXANDER SOTO and WALTER G. SOTO,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00680 (Patent 9,887,795 B2)
IPR2023-00681 (Patent 10,263,723 B2)
IPR2023-00682 (Patent 10,771,181 B2)¹

Before THU A. DANG, GARTH D. BAER, and
KARA L. SZPONDOWSKI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

DANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Joint Motion to Terminate Proceeding Due to
Settlement before Institution
37 C.F.R. § 42.74

¹ This Order applies to each of the above-listed proceedings. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each proceeding. The parties are not authorized to use this heading style in any subsequent papers.

IPR2023-00680 (Patent 9,887,795 B2)
IPR2023-00681 (Patent 10,263,723 B2)
IPR2023-00682 (Patent 10,771,181 B2)

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively “the Parties”) have requested that the above-identified *inter partes* review proceedings be terminated pursuant to a settlement. On February 3, 2025, the Parties filed a Joint Motion to Terminate Pursuant to 35 US.C. § 317 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74 in each of the above-identified proceedings (“Motion”). Paper 32.² The Parties previously sought authorization to file the Joint Motion and received that authorization via email on January 7, 2024. Motion 3.

II. DISCUSSION

In the Motions, the Parties represent that they have reached an agreement that settles their disputes regarding the challenged patents and their underlying litigations have been dismissed. *Id.* at 3–4. The Parties state that “there is no written settlement agreement between the parties” and cite an email between the Parties memorializing their agreement to terminate the above-identified proceedings in view of the dismissal. *Id.* at 3 (citing Ex. 2023).

We have not yet instituted a trial on the above-identified proceedings. Nor have we decided the merits of the proceedings, and final written decisions has not been entered in the proceedings. The Parties have shown adequately that termination of the proceedings is appropriate. Under these circumstances, we determine that good cause exists to terminate the proceedings with respect to the Parties.

² For efficiency, we refer to Papers and Exhibits filed in IPR2023-00680. Similar Papers and Exhibits were filed in IPR2023-00681 and IPR2023-00682.

IPR2023-00680 (Patent 9,887,795 B2)
IPR2023-00681 (Patent 10,263,723 B2)
IPR2023-00682 (Patent 10,771,181 B2)

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 Motions are *granted* and IPR2023-00680, IPR2023-00681, and IPR2023-00682 are *terminated* with respect to Petitioner and Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00680 (Patent 9,887,795 B2)
IPR2023-00681 (Patent 10,263,723 B2)
IPR2023-00682 (Patent 10,771,181 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Scott Stevens
Karlee Wroblewski
Matthew Welch
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
scott.stevens@alston.com
karlee.wroblewski@alston.com
matt.welch@alston.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Qi Tong
Irene Lee
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT
ptong@raklaw.com
ilee@raklaw.com