

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TEXTRON SPECIALIZED VEHICLES INC.

Petitioner

v.

SZ DJI TECHNOLOGY CO. LTD.

Patent Owner

Case IPR 2023-01287
U.S. Patent No. 11,482,121

**JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE *INTER PARTES REVIEW* OF
U.S. PATENT 11,482,121 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.72**

Submitted Electronically

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72, Petitioner Textron Specialized Vehicles Inc. (“TSV”) and Patent Owner SZ DJI Technology Co. Ltd. (“DJI”) jointly request dismissal and termination of this *Inter Partes Review* of U.S. Patent 11,482,121.

On February 22, 2024, the Parties informed the Board of the resolution via email and indicated their intent to file a motion to terminate the petition with respect to both the Patent Owner and the Petitioner and file a copy of the agreement, subject to a motion to keep the agreement confidential and separate from the file of U.S. Patent 11,482,121. As set forth in an email dated February 23, 2024, the Board authorized the filing of the joint motion to terminate this proceeding. Accordingly, Petitioner and Patent Owner jointly request termination of the present proceeding.

II. ARGUMENT

A joint motion to terminate generally must “(1) include a brief explanation as to why termination is appropriate; (2) identify all parties in any related litigation involving the patents at issue; (3) identify any related proceedings currently before the Office; and (4) discuss specifically the current status of each such related litigation or proceeding with respect to each party to the litigation or proceeding.” *Heartland Tanning, Inc. v. Sunless, Inc.*, IPR2014-00018, Paper 26 at 2 (PTAB July 28, 2014).

A. Brief Explanation as to Why Termination Is Appropriate

Petitioner and Patent Owner have entered into a written confidential agreement that fully resolves this matter. The Parties are concurrently filing a copy of the agreement as Exhibit 1012 along with a motion to treat it as confidential business information pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74. In view of that request, Exhibit 1012 has been filed for access by “Parties and Board Only.”

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b), the Parties acknowledge that, as of the filing of this Motion and the concurrent Motion to Keep Confidential, that Exhibit 1012 represents the entire agreement or understanding between the Parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this proceeding, and further, that Exhibit 1012 is a true and accurate copy of the agreement between the Parties that resolves the present proceeding. The Parties agree that neither Patent Owner nor Petitioner will be prejudiced by termination of this proceeding.

The parties “may terminate the proceeding ..., unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding.” Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, at 4 (Nov. 2019). Patent Owner has yet to file its Response, and the Board has yet to decide the merits of this proceeding. The parties have now settled their dispute and have reached agreement to terminate the Petition.

Public policy favors terminating the present Petition for *Inter Partes Review*. Congress and federal courts have expressed a strong interest in encouraging

settlement in litigation. *See Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August*, 450 U.S. 346, 352 (1981) (“The purpose of [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 68 is to encourage the settlement of litigation.”); *Bergh v. Dep’t of Transp.*, 794 F.2d 1575, 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (“The law favors settlement of cases.”), cert. denied, 479 U.S. 950 (1986). The Federal Circuit places a particularly strong emphasis on settlement. *See Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe v. United States*, 806 F.2d 1046, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (noting that the law favors settlement to mitigate antagonism and hostility between parties). And the Board’s Trial Practice Guide stresses that “[t]here are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding.” Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, at 86 (Nov. 2019).

B. Identification of Parties and Status of Litigation

This *Inter Partes Review* is related to SZ DJI Technology Co. Ltd. v. Textron Specialized Vehicles Inc., C.A. No. 23-55 (JNR) (D. Del.), which the parties will concurrently dismiss with prejudice. The parties are not aware of any other litigation involving the patent-at-issue.

C. Identification and Status of Proceedings Before the USPTO

On August 7, 2023, TSV filed its Petition for *Inter Partes Review* in IPR2023-01287. On November 24, 2023, DJI filed Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response (Paper No. 6). On February 21, 2024, the Board issued a Decision to Institute (Paper No. 10). Patent Owner’s response is due on May 15, 2024. *See* Paper No. 11.

TSV and DJI have now resolved their dispute and reached agreement to terminate this proceeding. Additionally, the parties are not aware of any other pending USPTO proceedings regarding the patent-at-issue. The USPTO can conserve its resources by terminating now, removing the need for the Board to further consider the arguments and to render a Final Written Decision. Therefore, the Parties respectfully request termination of this *Inter Partes Review* of U.S. Patent 11,482,121.

Date: February 27, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian W. Oaks/

/ Matthew A. Argenti /

Brian W. Oaks
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
300 Congress Ave., Suite 2200
Austin Texas 78701
Tel: 512.726.2574
boaks@mwe.com
Reg. No. 44,981

Matthew A. Argenti, Reg. No. 61,836
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &
ROSATI
650 Page Mills Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Tel.: 650-354-4145
Email: margenti@wsgr.com

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Jeffery S. Becker
Reg. No. 68,553
Phone: 214-953-6526
jeff.becker@bakerbotts.com
Harrison Rich
Reg. No. 65,132
Phone: 214.953.6896
harrison.rich@bakerbotts.com
2001 Ross Ave., Suite 900
Dallas, TX 75201-2980
Fax: 214-661-4526

Richard Torczon
USPTO Reg. No. 34,448
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &
ROSATI
1700 K Street, N.W., Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Tel.: 202-972-8811
Email: rtorczon@wsgr.com

*Counsel for Patent Owner
SZ DJI Technology Co. Ltd.*

Boyang Zhang
Phone: 212.408.2561
Reg. No. 77,498
boyang.zhang@bakerbotts.com
30 Rockefeller Center
New York, NY 10112
Fax: 212.259.2561

*Counsel for Petitioner
Textron Specialized Vehicles Inc.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies on February 27, 2024, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT 11,482,121 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.72** was served to the following counsel for Patent Owner by email:

Matthew Argenti (margenti@wsgr.com)
Richard Torczon (rtorczon@wsgr.com)

Date: February 27, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian W. Oaks/

Brian W. Oaks
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
300 Congress Ave., Suite 2200
Austin Texas 78701
Tel: 512.726.2574
boaks@mwe.com
Reg. No. 44,981

*Lead Attorney for Petitioner
Textron Specialized Vehicles Inc.*