

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.,
T-MOBILE USA, INC., and AT&T SERVICES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01041 (Patent 8,924,543 B2)
IPR2024-01042 (Patent 8,924,543 B2)¹

Before HYUN J. JUNG, SCOTT B. HOWARD, and
STEPHEN E. BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

JUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

TERMINATION
Due to Settlement After Institution of Trial
35 U.S.C. § 317; 37 C.F.R. § 42.74

¹ This Order addresses issues that are the same in the identified cases. The Board exercises its discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this caption without express permission from the Board.

I. INTRODUCTION

With the Board’s authorization, Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively referred to as “the Parties”) filed a Joint Motion to Terminate *Inter Partes* Review in each of the above-identified proceedings due to settlement. Paper 15 (“Joint Motion” or “Mot.”).² In support of the Joint Motion filed in each proceeding, the Parties filed a confidential Patent License Agreement (Ex. 2007) and Partial Resolution Agreements (Exs. 2004–2006) (collectively, “Settlement Agreements”),³ as well as a Joint Request to Keep Separate Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c) (Paper 16, “Joint Request” or “Req.”). The Parties also filed copies of joint motions to dismiss related litigation. Exs. 2008–2010.

II. DISCUSSION

In the Joint Motion, the Parties represent that they have reached an agreement to jointly seek termination of the above-identified *inter partes* review proceedings. *See* Mot. The Parties represent that “a true copy of the agreements regarding dismissal and additional license agreements that resolve the disputes in the above-captioned *inter partes* review relating to the Patent-in-Suit as between Petitioners and Headwater are filed herewith” and “[t]here are no other collateral agreements between the parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination sought.” *Id.* at 1.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 317(a), “[a]n *inter partes* review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided

² We cite to papers filed in IPR2024-01041. The Parties filed similar papers in IPR2024-01042 (Papers 14, 15).

³ We cite to exhibits filed in IPR2024-01041. The Parties filed similar exhibits in IPR2024-01042 (Exs. 2001–2007).

IPR2024-01041 (Patent 8,924,543 B2)

IPR2024-01042 (Patent 8,924,543 B2)

the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed.”

Section 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) also provides that if no petitioner remains in the *inter partes* review, the Office may terminate the review.

We instituted trials in the above-identified proceedings on January 14, 2025. IPR2024-01041, Paper 10; IPR2024-01042, Paper 9. We have not yet decided the merits of the proceedings, and final written decisions have not been entered. Notwithstanding that the proceedings have moved beyond the preliminary stage, the Parties have shown adequately that termination of the proceedings is appropriate. Under these circumstances, we determine that good cause exists to terminate the proceedings with respect to the Parties.

After reviewing the Settlement Agreements between Petitioner and Patent Owner (Exs. 2004–2007), we find that the Settlement Agreements contain confidential business information regarding the terms of settlement. We determine that good cause exists to treat the agreements between Petitioner and Patent Owner as business confidential information pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

This Order does not constitute a final written decision pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a).

III. ORDER

In view of the above, it is

ORDERED that the Joint Motion to Terminate *Inter Partes* Review in each of the above proceedings is *granted*, and the above proceedings are *terminated* with respect to Petitioner and Patent Owner pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72; and

IPR2024-01041 (Patent 8,924,543 B2)

IPR2024-01042 (Patent 8,924,543 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Request to Keep Separate Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c) in each of the above proceedings is *granted*, and the Settlement Agreements shall remain designated as “Filing Party and Board” in the Board’s filing system, shall be made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause, and shall be kept separate from the files of U.S. Patent No. 8,924,543 B2, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

IPR2024-01041 (Patent 8,924,543 B2)

IPR2024-01042 (Patent 8,924,543 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Patrick D. McPherson

Kevin P. Anderson

Joseph A. Powers

DUANE MORRIS LLP

pdmcperson@duanemorris.com

kpanderson@duanemorris.com

japowers@duanemorris.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Reza Mirzaie

Dale Chang

Amy Hayden

James A. Milkey

Neil Rubin

Philip X. Wang

RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT

rmirzaie@raklaw.com

dchang@raklaw.com

ahayden@raklaw.com

jmilkey@raklaw.com

nrubin@raklaw.com

pwang@raklaw.com