

Filed: April 3, 2024

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LG ELECTRONICS INC.
Petitioner,

v.

JAWBONE INNOVATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01248
U.S. Patent No. 8,467,543

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR REFUND OF POST-INSTITUTION FEES

IPR2023-01248

U.S. Patent No. 8,467,543

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.26(a) and the Patent and Trademark Office’s Final Rule Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees, 78 Fed. Reg. 4212, 4232-4234 (Jan. 18, 2013), LG Electronics Inc. (“LGE”) hereby requests a refund in the amount of \$27,000 to be credited to Deposit Account No. 232405.

On July 26, 2023, Petitioner filed a Petition for Inter Partes Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,467,543 with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, and the Petition was assigned case number IPR2022-01248. (Paper Nos. 3, 4.) In accordance with the fee schedule specified in 37 C.F.R. § 42.15(a), Petitioner provided at the time of filing of its Petition a payment via Deposit Account No. 232405 in the amount of \$21,250 to cover the Inter Partes Review Request Fee and a further \$27,000 to cover the Inter Partes Review Post-Institution Fee.

The Board instituted trial on January 19, 2024. (Paper No. 9.) On March 28, 2024, however, the Board entered a decision terminating this proceeding in accordance with a settlement agreement between the parties. (Paper No. 16.) The proceeding was terminated before briefing was complete, before any oral hearing, and before the Board had made any decision on the merits. (Paper No. 16.)

37 C.F.R. § 1.26(a) states that “[t]he Director may refund any fee paid...in excess of that required.” Although that regulation does not specifically address a request for refund of an Inter Partes Review Post-Institution Fee, the Patent and Trademark Office’s Final Rule Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees, 78 Fed. Reg.

IPR2023-01248

U.S. Patent No. 8,467,543

4212, 4233 (Jan. 18, 2013) states that “[t]he Office...chooses to return fees for postinstitution services should a review not be instituted.” And although that statement does not address a request for refund of a post-institution fee when a review has been instituted, when the review is terminated before the Board has expended the time to prepare for and conduct an oral hearing or to make any decision on the merits as in this case, such a request would seem to be within the scope of 37 C.F.R. § 1.26(a). Indeed, in *Hisense Visual Technology Co. v. LG Electronics Inc.*, IPR2020-01208, Paper Nos. 18 and 19 (Apr. 5, 2021 and Apr. 7, 2021), a refund of the post-institution fee was allowed when the review was terminated after institution but before briefing was complete and, therefore, well before oral hearing and well before any decision on the merits. Likewise, in *SK Hynix Inc. v. Netlist, Inc.*, IPR2020-01421, Paper Nos. 17 and 18 (May 27, 2021 and June 10, 2021), a refund of the post-institution fee was allowed in the same situation. The proceedings in this case were also terminated before briefing was complete and, consequently, well before oral hearing and well before any decision on the merits.

Accordingly, consistent with the refunds issued in *Hisense* and *SK Hynix*, and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.26(a), Petitioner requests a refund in the amount of \$27,000 for the Post-Institution Fee that it paid to the USPTO in connection with this proceeding, or alternatively, whatever portion of that fee the Office deems was “paid...in excess of that required,” to be credited to Deposit Account No. 232405.

IPR2023-01248
U.S. Patent No. 8,467,543

Dated: April 3, 2024

/Indranil Mukerji/
Indranil Mukerji
Reg. No. 46,944
WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER
LLP
1875 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1238
Telephone: (202) 303-1000
Facsimile: (202) 303-2000
Counsel for Petitioner
LG ELECTRONICS INC.

IPR2023-01248

U.S. Patent No. 8,467,543

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on April 3, 2024, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Petitioner's Request For Refund Of Post-Institution Fees to be served via electronic mail to Patent Owner's counsel of record below:

Alfred R. Fabricant (ffabricant@fabricantllp.com)
Peter Lambrianakos (plambrianakos@fabricantllp.com)
Vincent J. Rubino, III (vrubino@fabricantllp.com)
Enrique W. Iturralde (eiturralde@fabricantllp.com)
Richard Cowell (rcowell@fabricantllp.com)
Jacob Ostling (jostling@fabricantllp.com)
ptab@fabricantllp.com
Justin Kurt Truelove (kurt@truelovelawfirm.com)

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP

/Indranil Mukerji/

Counsel for Petitioner,
LG ELECTRONICS INC.