

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SHARKNINJA, INC.,
SHARKNINJA OPERATING LLC,
SHARKNINJA MANAGEMENT LLC, AND
SHARKNINJA SALES COMPANY

Petitioners,

v.

DYSON TECHNOLOGY LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2023-01322

U.S. PATENT NO. 10,433,687

RENEWED JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PROCEEDING

PATENT OWNER'S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
2001	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2017/0071426 A1 ("Krebs")
2002	GB 2440111B
2003	Chinese Patent Application No. 201610830364.1
2004	Chinese patent document no. CN1178622C
2005	China National Intellectual Property Administration, Case No. 4W114231 (Oct. 19, 2022) original
2006	China National Intellectual Property Administration, Case No. 4W114231 (Oct. 19, 2022) translation
2007	The People's Republic of China Beijing Intellectual Property Court Administrative Judgment (Oct. 25, 2023) original
2008	The People's Republic of China Beijing Intellectual Property Court Administrative Judgment (Oct. 25, 2023) translation
2009	U.S. Patent Application Publication 2016/0150923 A1 ("Conrad
2010	U.S. Patent No. 8,156,609 ("Milne")
2011	Chinese patent document no. CN101489454A
2012	Chinese patent document no. CN1361673A
2013	China National Intellectual Property Administration, Case No. 4W114082 (Sept. 23, 2022) original
2014	China National Intellectual Property Administration, Case No. 4W114082 (Sept. 23, 2022) translation
2015	U.S. Patent No. 1,871,624 ("the '624 patent")
2016	Declaration of Brianna Lynn Silverstein in Support of Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission
2017	Declaration of Donald J. Davidshofer
2018	Deposition Transcript of Joseph Fester (Apr. 26, 2024)
2019	U.S. Patent No. 8,789.235 ("the '235 patent")
2020	https://www.dyson.com/vacuum-cleaners/cordless/v10/shop-all (accessed May 7, 2024)
2021	Dyson's Pricey Cordless Vac is So Good, It's Killing Cords Altogether, Mar. 8, 2018, <i>available at</i> https://gizmodo.com/dysons-pricey-cordless-vac-is-so-good-its-killing-cord-1823469578 (accessed May 7, 2024)

Exhibit	Description
2022	Dyson Cyclone V10: Seriously powerful cordless vacuum starts at \$500, Mar. 5, 2018, <i>available at</i> https://www.cnet.com/reviews/dyson-cyclone-v10-absolute-preview/ (accessed May 7, 2024)
2023	Dyson Cyclone V10 vacuum review: Bigger isn't always better, Mar. 6, 2018, <i>available at</i>
	https://web.archive.org/web/20180306235846/https7mashable.com/2018/03/06/dyson-cyclone-v10-review/#nWCAg.es4kqi (accessed May 7, 2024)
2024	Dyson to go all cordless with vacuums, starting with the Cyclone V10, Mar. 6, 2018, <i>available at</i> https://www.engadget.com/2018-03-06-dyson-cyclone-v10-vacuum-cordless-handheld.html (accessed May 7, 2024)
2025	Dyson is done with corded vacuums as the powerful Cyclone V10 looks to clean up, Mar. 6, 2018, <i>available at</i> https://www.techradar.com/news/the-dyson-cyclone-v10-wants-to-clean-up-on-powerful-cordless-vacuums (accessed May 7, 2024)
2026	Declaration of Jay Emerick in Support of Patent Owner's Unopposed Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission of Jay Emerick
2027 [Corrected]	Declaration of Caitlin Dean in Support of Patent Owner's Unopposed Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission of Caitlin Dean
2028	Dyson's IPR Hearing Presentation
2029	Settlement Agreement (CONFIDENTIAL)

Petitioners SharkNinja, Inc., SharkNinja Operating LLC, SharkNinja Management LLC, and SharkNinja Sales Company (“Petitioners”), and Patent Owner Dyson Technology Limited (“Patent Owner”) have reached a settlement. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74, and the Board’s Order granting leave for the parties to refile their Joint Motion to Terminate Proceeding, Paper No. 50 at 4, Petitioners and Patent Owner file this renewed motion to terminate the present *inter partes* review proceeding.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Petitioners and Patent Owner have reached agreement (the “Settlement Agreement”) to resolve their disputes.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b), the Settlement Agreement is in writing, and a true and correct copy was previously filed as Confidential Exhibit 2029. The parties also concurrently filed a Joint Motion to Terminate, Paper No. 47, which the Board denied without prejudice, stating that “because the Settlement Agreement filed by the Parties may not be the entire agreement between the Parties, the Motion is denied” and that “a renewed motion to terminate does not appear to be warranted until the expiration of any period of time during which the Parties may contemplate additional agreements.” Paper 50 at 2, 4. That time period has since expired, and the parties have not entered into any other agreements. The Settlement Agreement previously filed as Confidential Exhibit 2029 is the only agreement, and there are no

other agreements, written or oral, between or among the parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the dismissal of the proceeding.

II. RELIEF REQUESTED

Termination of this *inter partes* review is requested, and all the parties respectfully submit that such termination is justified. “There are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding.” Consolidated Trial Practice Guide 86 (Nov. 2019). “The Board expects that a proceeding will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement, unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding.” *Id.* (citing 35 U.S.C. §§ 317(a)).

The Board should terminate this proceeding as the Settling Parties jointly request, for the following reasons.

First, the parties have met the statutory requirement that they file a “joint request” to terminate before the Office “has decided the merits of the proceeding.” 35 U.S.C. § 317(a). Under section 317(a), an *inter partes* review shall be terminated upon such joint request “unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed.” There are no other preconditions recited in 35 U.S.C. § 317(a).

Second, the parties have reached a settlement as to all the disputes in this proceeding and as to the ’687 patent. A true copy of the Settlement Agreement was previously filed as Confidential Ex. 2029. There are no other agreements, written or

oral, between or among the parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the dismissal of the proceeding. Pursuant to the Board's Order, Paper 50 at 4, **the Parties represent that any agreement or understanding between them, including any collateral agreements referred to in such agreement or understanding, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this inter partes review proceeding are in writing and a true copy of every such agreement or understanding has been filed as an exhibit in this proceeding.**

Third, termination would save significant further expenditure of resources by the parties. Termination upon settlement, as requested, would also further the purpose of *inter partes* review proceedings, which seek to provide an efficient and less costly alternative forum for patent disputes. Further, maintaining the proceeding would discourage further settlements, as patent owners in similar situations would have a strong disincentive to settle if they perceived that an *inter partes* review would continue regardless of a settlement.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioners and Patent Owner respectfully request termination of this *inter partes* review.

IPR2023-01322 Joint Motion to Terminate Proceeding

Date: January 31, 2025

/s/ Christian Huehns

Christian Huehns (Reg. No. 77,717)
Jay Emerick (*pro hac vice*)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
333 West Wolf Point Plaza
Chicago, IL 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2000
Facsimile: (312) 862-2200
christian.huehns@kirkland.com
jay.emerick@kirkland.com
DysonIPR@kirkland.com

Matthew Benjamin Hershkowitz
(Reg. No. 77,881)
Caitlin Dean (*pro hac vice*)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Ave
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900
matt.hershkowitz@kirkland.com
caitlin.dean@kirkland.com

Attorneys for Patent Owner

Date: January 31, 2025

/s/ Brian M. Buroker

Brian M. Buroker (Reg. No. 39,125)
Shuo Josh Zhang (Reg. No. 71,774)
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1700 M Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: (202) 955-8500
Fax: (202) 467-0539
bburoker@gibsondunn.com
szhang@gibsondunn.com

Brian A. Rosenthal (*pro hac vice*)
Vivian Lu (Reg. No. 74,443)
Ahmed ElDessouki (*pro hac vice*)
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166
brosenthal@gibsondunn.com
vlu@gibsondunn.com
aeldessouki@gibsondunn.com

Nathan R. Curtis (Reg. No. 70,471)
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201
ncurtis@gibsondunn.com

Attorneys for Petitioners

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a complete copy of the foregoing document was served on January 31, 2025 on counsel of record via email to the following addresses:

GDC-SharkNinjaIPRD@gibsondunn.com

DysonIPR@kirkland.com

/s/ Christian Huehns

Christian Huehns (Reg. No. 77,717)