

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. IPR2023-01324

U.S. PATENT NO. 9,414,662

JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PROCEEDING

PATENT OWNER'S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
2001	Declaration of Brianna Lynn Silverstein in Support of Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission
2002	Declaration of Breigh Nonte Roszelle, Ph.D.
2003	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, Petitioners and Patent Owner move 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 is being filed as Confidential Exhibit 2003. The Settlement Agreement is being filed electronically with access to “Board Only.” A “Joint Request to Treat Settlement Agreement as Business Confidential Information” is being filed concurrently with this Joint Motion to Terminate Proceeding, to treat the Settlement Agreement as business confidential information and to keep it separate from the files of the involved patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

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 ’662 patent. A true copy of the Settlement Agreement is filed concurrently herewith. *See* Confidential Ex. 2003. The parties request that the Settlement Agreement be treated as business confidential information and be kept separate from the files of this proceeding in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). There are currently no other agreements, written or oral, between or among the parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the dismissal of the 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.

IPR2023-01324 Joint Motion to Terminate Proceeding

Date: January 6, 2025

/s/ Christopher P Bruenjes

Christopher P. Bruenjes (Reg. No. 62,941)
MEDLER FERRO WOODHOUSE &
MILLS PLLC
8201 Greensboro Dr., Suite 1060
McLean, VA 22102
Telephone: (703) 712-8249
Facsimile: (703) 712-8525
cbruenges@medlerferro.com

John G. Smith (Reg. No. 33,818)
Brianna L. Silverstein (*pro hac vice*)
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE &
REATH LLP
1500 K St NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 842-8886
Facsimile: (202) 842-8465
John.smith@faegredrinker.com
Brianna.silverstein@faegredrinker.com

Attorneys for Patent Owner

Date: January 6, 2025

/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 6, 2025 on counsel of record via email to the following addresses:

GDC-SharkNinjaIPRD@gibsondunn.com

cbruenjes@medlerferro.com

john.smith@faegredrinker.com

/s/ Christopher P Bruenjes/
Christopher P Bruenjes (Reg. No. 62,941)