

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.

IPR2023-00960
Patent 8,238,754 B2

Before THU A. DANG, JOSIAH C. COCKS, and KEVIN C. TROCK,
Administrative Patent Judges.

TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

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

Petitioner, Nokia of America Corporation, and Patent Owner, Alexander Soto and Walter G. Soto, (collectively “the Parties”) have requested that this *inter partes* review proceeding be terminated pursuant to a settlement. On February 3, 2025, the Parties filed a Joint Motion to Terminate Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74 (“Motion”). Paper 47. The Parties received authorization to file the Motion on January 7, 2024. Motion 4.

In the Motion, the Parties jointly request termination of this proceeding “because the Parties have resolved their dispute, and because the underlying litigations has been dismissed, and the Parties no longer desire to expend resources maintaining this proceeding.” *Id.* The Parties also state that “there is no written settlement agreement between the parties” and cite to an email (Ex. 2034) between the Parties as “confirmation of the parties’ agreement as it relates to this IPR that Nokia moves to withdraw and jointly moves to terminate the proceedings.” *Id.*

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.” It is also provided in 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) that if no petitioner remains in the *inter partes* review, the Office may terminate the review.

We instituted trial in the above-identified proceeding. Paper 19. 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 termination of the proceeding is appropriate. Under these circumstances, we

IPR2023-00960
Patent 8,238,754 B2

determine that good cause exists to terminate the proceeding with respect to the Parties. This Order does not constitute a final written decision pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a).

ORDER

Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, it is

ORDERED that the Motion is *granted* and IPR2023-00960 is *terminated* with respect to Petitioner and Patent Owner.

For PETITIONER:

Scott Stevens
Karlee Wroblewski
Matthew Welch
Daniel O'Connor
Mary Riolo
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
scott.stevens@alston.com
karlee.wroblewski@alston.com
matt.welch@alston.com
dan.oconnor@alston.com
mary.riolo@alston.com

For PATENT OWNER:

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