

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DIRECTV, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

ENTROPIC COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01063 (Patent 8,320,566 B2)
IPR2024-01065 (Patent 8,363,681 B2) ¹

Before LYNNE H. BROWNE, BARBARA A. PARVIS, and
FREDERICK C. LANEY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PARVIS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Dismissal Prior to Institution of Trial
35 U.S.C. § 314

¹ This Order applies to all of the captioned proceedings. These cases have not been consolidated or joined. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

IPR2024-01063 (Patent 8,320,566 B2)

IPR2024-01065 (Patent 8,363,681 B2)

I. INTRODUCTION

On July 1, 2024, DIRECTV, LLC (“Petitioner”) filed Petitions in IPR2024-01063 (Paper 1) and IPR2024-01065 (Paper 1) requesting *inter partes* reviews of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,320,566 B2 and U.S. Patent No. 8,363,681 B2, respectively. With the Board’s authorization, Petitioner filed Motions to Withdraw Petitions for *Inter Partes* Review. IPR2024-01063, Paper 7 (“Motion”)²; IPR2024-01065, Paper 7. In the Motions, Petitioner seeks to withdraw the Petitions and to terminate the cases. Motion 1–2. Entropic Communications, LLC (“Patent Owner”) has not yet filed Preliminary Responses to the Petitions. In each proceeding, Petitioner informs us that Patent Owner “does not oppose the instant request.” *Id.* at 1.

II. DISCUSSION

Petitioner asserts the following:

Patent Owner has not yet filed its preliminary patent owner’s response and no decision on whether to institute *inter partes* review has been made. Furthermore, the Petition in the instant proceeding was filed with a motion for joinder with the petition filed in IPR2024-00555. Papers 1, 3. The Board denied institution of that proceeding on August 21, 2024. *DISH Network LLC v. Entropic Communications, LLC*, IPR2024-00555, Paper No. 10.

Motion 1. Petitioner argues that withdrawal of the Petitions “would save considerable resources and promote the efficiency of the Board.” *Id.*

We find Petitioner’s arguments to be consistent with the records of these and the related cases. Under these circumstances, we determine that it is appropriate to grant Petitioner’s Motions to withdraw the Petitions and terminate the proceedings.

² Given the similarities in issues, hereafter we refer to the papers filed in IPR2024-01063 as representative.

IPR2024-01063 (Patent 8,320,566 B2)

IPR2024-01065 (Patent 8,363,681 B2)

III. ORDER

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is:

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions to withdraw its Petitions for *inter partes* review in the above-identified proceedings are *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Petitions in the above-identified proceedings are *dismissed* and the proceedings are *terminated* as to all parties.

IPR2024-01063 (Patent 8,320,566 B2)

IPR2024-01065 (Patent 8,363,681 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Cory Bell

Daniel Klodowski

Safiya Aguilar

Victor Palace

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,

GARRETT, & DUNNER LLP

cory.bell@finnegan.com

daniel.klodowski@finnegan.com

safiya.aguilar@finnegan.com

victor.palace@finnegan.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Jason Engel

Erik Halverson

Joshua Andrews

K&L GATES LLP

jason.engel.ptab@klgates.com

erik.halverson@klgates.com

Joshua.andrews@klgates.com