

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CROGA INNOVATIONS LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01282
Patent 7,738,368 B2

Before TERRENCE W. McMILLIN and RUSSELL E. CASS,
Administrative Patent Judges.

PER CURIAM.

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

I. INTRODUCTION

With the Board’s authorization, Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively, “the Parties”) filed a Joint Motion to Terminate the above-identified proceeding due to settlement. Paper 11 (“Joint Motion”). In support of the Joint Motion, the Parties filed a copy of a Joint Stipulation of Dismissal of Asserted Patent (Ex. 1130 (“Stipulation”)), which the parties filed in the related district court litigation (Joint Motion, 1–2).

II. DISCUSSION

In the Joint Motion, the Parties represent that their “dispute with respect to the ’368 Patent has been resolved,” and that “the district court has issued an Order (Ex. 1129) accepting and entering the Parties’ stipulation to the dismissal of the ’368 patent with prejudice from the co-pending litigation.” Joint Motion 1. The Parties also indicate, with respect to the Stipulation, “that there are no other collateral agreements or understandings, oral or written, between the parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of the present proceeding, and that Ex. 1130 represents a true and accurate copy of the agreement between the parties.” *Id.* at 2. According to the Parties, “no other party’s rights will be prejudiced by the termination of this proceeding.” *Id.* at 3–4.

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 the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed.” Section 317(a) also provides that if no petitioner remains in the *inter partes* review, the Office may terminate the review.

We instituted a trial in this proceeding on February 13, 2025. Paper 7.

We have not yet decided the merits of the proceeding, and a final written decision has not been entered. Notwithstanding that the proceeding has moved beyond the preliminary stage, the Parties have adequately shown that the termination of the proceeding is appropriate. Under these circumstances, we determine that good cause exists to terminate the proceeding with respect to the Parties.

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

III. ORDER

For the reasons discussed above, it is:

ORDERED that the Joint Motion is *granted*, and IPR2024-01282 is *terminated* pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72.

IPR2024-01282
Patent 7,738,368 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Theodore Foster
David McCombs
Gregory Huh
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com
david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com
gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Brett Cooper
Seth Lindner
BC LAW GROUP, P.C.
bcooper@bc-lawgroup.com
slindner@bc-lawgroup.com

Robert Auchter
AUCHTER PLLC
robert@auchterlaw.com