

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ANKER INNOVATIONS LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

POWERMAT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00995 (Patent 9,083,204 B2)¹
IPR2024-00996 (Patent 8,626,461 B2)

Before KEN B. BARRETT, KARA L. SZPONDOWSKI, and
RYAN H. FLAX, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BARRETT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Extending One-Year Pendency for Good Cause
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11); 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c)

¹ We use this caption for convenience and efficiency. The parties are not authorized to do so without prior approval.

IPR2024-00995 (Patent 9,083,204 B2)

IPR2024-00996 (Patent 8,626,461 B2)

Petitioner filed Petitions requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–6, 8, and 10–13 of U.S. Patent No. 9,083,204 B2 in IPR2024-00995, and of claims 13–18 of U.S. Patent No. 8,626,461 B2 in IPR2024-00996. On February 20, 2025, the Board instituted trial in both cases. IPR2024-00995, Paper 7; IPR2024-00996, Paper 7. The one-year deadline to issue final written decisions, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11), is February 20, 2026.

On February 3, 2026, the parties jointly notified the Board by email stating that they have reached an agreement in principle to settle the subject matters of these proceedings, and requesting a thirty-day extension of the one-year deadline. The parties represent that they have been working to finalize a settlement agreement, but need additional time.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11), “the final determination in an *inter partes* review [shall] be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a review under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months” The Director has delegated the authority to extend the one-year period to the Chief Administrative Patent Judge. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c) (2024). In particular, 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c) provides:

An *inter partes* review proceeding shall be administered such that pendency before the Board after institution is normally no more than one year. The time can be extended by up to six months for good cause by the Chief Administrative Patent Judge

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c), the Chief Administrative Patent Judge has determined here that good cause exists to extend the one-year period for issuing Final Written Decisions here. IPR2024-00995,

IPR2024-00995 (Patent 9,083,204 B2)

IPR2024-00996 (Patent 8,626,461 B2)

Paper 29; IPR2024-00996, Paper 32. Accordingly, the time to administer each of the present proceedings is extended by up to six months.

The parties are authorized to file in each of IPR2024-00995 and IPR2024-00996 a joint motion to terminate the proceeding. This authorization is subject to the relevant statutes and regulations, including the requirement that the joint motions certify and include an exhibit containing a true copy of all agreements made in connection with or contemplation of the requested terminations, including any collateral agreements. The joint motions must also certify that there are no other collateral agreements in connection with the settlement, or else file such agreements. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 317(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b). In addition, the Board authorizes the parties to file in each proceeding a joint request to treat such agreement(s) as business confidential information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). That request may be part of the joint motion to terminate or may be a separate paper, and the exhibit containing the agreement(s) should be filed “For Board only” or “For Board and Parties Only.”

In light of the parties’ request for a thirty-day extension to the original deadline for issuing final written decisions, the joint motions to terminate the proceedings are due no later than March 23, 2026. If the parties have not filed the motions on or before that date, the Board may proceed with deciding the merits of the cases and the issuance of Final Written Decisions. *See* Patent Trial and Appeal Board Trial Practice Guide § II.N, *available at* www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/trial-practice-guide (“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.” (citing 35 U.S.C. §§ 317(a), 327)); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(a) (“The parties may

IPR2024-00995 (Patent 9,083,204 B2)

IPR2024-00996 (Patent 8,626,461 B2)

agree to settle any issue in a proceeding, but the Board is not a party to the settlement and may independently determine any question of jurisdiction, patentability, or Office practice.”).

It is:

ORDERED that good cause exists to extend the time of pendency in these proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that these proceedings are extended by up to six months; and

FURTHER ORDERED that, if the parties finalize a settlement agreement, the parties shall file, in each subject case, a joint motion to terminate the proceeding no later than March 23, 2026.

IPR2024-00995 (Patent 9,083,204 B2)

IPR2024-00996 (Patent 8,626,461 B2)

PETITIONER:

Michael Hawkins

Nicholas Stephens

Joseph Bauer

Thomas Reger

Terry Stalford

Yong Peng

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

hawkins@fr.com

nstephens@fr.com

jbauer@fr.com

reger@fr.com

stalford@fr.com

epeng@fr.com

PATENT OWNER:

Robert Pluta

William Barrow

Seth Bruneel

William Nash

MAYER BROWN LLP

rpluta@mayerbrown.com

wbarrow@mayerbrown.com

sbruneel@mayerbrown.com

bnash@mayerbrown.com