

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REOLINK DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

KT IMAGING USA, LLC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01154 (Patent 8,314,481 B2)
IPR2024-01155 (Patent 8,004,602 B2)¹

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, SHEILA F. McSHANE, and
ELIZABETH J. REAGAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McSHANE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Dismissal Prior to Institution of Trial
37 C.F.R. § 42.71(a)

¹ This Decision addresses issues that are the same in these proceedings, so we exercise our discretion to issue one Decision to be docketed in each. The parties are not authorized to use this caption.

I. INTRODUCTION

On July 3, 2024, Reolink Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”) filed Petitions in IPR2024-01154 (Paper 1) and in IPR2024-01155 (Paper 1) requesting *inter partes* reviews of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 8,314,481 B2 and U.S. Patent No. 8,004,602 B2, respectively. With the Board’s authorization (Ex. 3001), Petitioner filed a Motions to Withdraw Petition for *Inter Partes* Review. IPR2024-01154, Paper 4 (“Motion”)²; IPR2024-01155, Paper 5. In the Motions, Petitioner seeks to withdraw the Petitions and to terminate the cases. Motion 2. KT Imaging USA, LLC., (“Patent Owner”) has not yet filed a Preliminary Responses to the Petitions. Petitioner informs us that Patent Owner “does not oppose this Motion.” *Id.*

II. ANALYSIS

These proceeding are in their preliminary stages, and no decisions on whether to institute *inter partes* reviews have been made. Petitioner asserts that “Patent Owner has not filed a preliminary response” and withdrawal of the petitions would “preserve both the Board’s and the parties’ resources.” Motion 3. Petitioner also states that “Patent Owner stated that it does not oppose the withdrawal of the petition,” and refers to an email from Patent Owner stating that it consents to Petitioner’s request for authorization to seek authorization to file the motions to withdraw the Petitions. *Id.* at 2; Ex. 1034, 1.

Under these circumstances, we determine that it is appropriate to grant Petitioner’s Motion to withdraw the Petitions and terminate the proceedings.

² Given the similarities in issues, hereafter we refer to the papers filed in IPR2024-01154 as representative.

IPR2024-01154 (Patent 8,314,481 B2)

IPR2024-01155 (Patent 8,004,602 B2)

III. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions to withdraw its Petitions for *inter partes* reviews in these cases are *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Petitions in these cases are *dismissed* and the proceedings are *terminated* as to all parties.

IPR2024-01154 (Patent 8,314,481 B2)

IPR2024-01155 (Patent 8,004,602 B2)

For PETITIONER

Timothy Bickham

Chris Liu

DENTONS US LLP

timothy.bickham@dentons.com

chris.liu@dentons.com

For PATENT OWNER

USPTO@DOCKETTRAK.COM

LNIU@MARQUEZIPLAW.COM

MAIL@MARQUEZIPLAW.COM

Juan Carlos A. Marquez

MARQUEZ INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW OFFICE PLLC

1629 K Street, NW

Suite 300

Washington, DC 20006

juancarlos@marqueziplaw.com

Kheyfits Belensky LLP

Dmitry Kheyfits

12600 Hill Country Blvd

Suite R-275

Austin, TX 78738

dkheyfits@kblit.com