Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 31
Entered: October 29, 2025

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

RAVENWHITE SECURITY, INC. and
SECURITY TECHNOLOGY, LLC,[1]
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01316 (Patent 10,594,823 B1)
IPR2024-01420 (Patent 11,562,402 B2)[2]

Before ST. JOHN COURTENAY, MICHAEL R. ZECHER, and FRANCES L. IPPOLITO, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

ZECHER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

---

[1] RavenWhite Security, Inc. is the Patent Owner in IPR2024-01316, whereas Security Technology, LLC is the Patent Owner in IPR2024-01420.

[2] The Termination Order applies to both proceedings. We, therefore, exercise our discretion to issue the same Termination Order in each proceeding.

I. DISCUSSION

With our authorization, Petitioner, Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., and Patent Owners, RavenWhite Security, Inc. and Security Technology, LLC, jointly filed the following: (1) a "Joint Motion to Terminate *Inter Partes Review* [IPR] of U.S. Patent No. 10,594,823 Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.72" (Paper 29, "Mot." or "Joint Motion"); (2) a true copy of the parties' settlement agreement (Ex. 1030); and (3) a "Joint Motion to Keep Confidential and Separate Under 35 U.S.C. § 317(B) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(C)" (Paper 30, "Joint Request").[3] For the following reasons, we *grant* the parties' Joint Motions to terminate these IPRs, as well as the parties' Joint Requests to file their settlement agreements as business confidential information and keep them separate from the files of the involved patent.

On March 24, 2025, we entered (1) a decision granting institution of an IPR of claims 1–10 of U.S. Patent No. 10,594,823 B1 (IPR2024-01316, Paper 12); and (2) a decision granting institution of an IPR of claims 1–19 of U.S. Patent No. 11,562,402 B2 (IPR2024-01420, Paper 12). Each of the trials, however, are still in an early stage because the parties have not completed substantive briefing and we have not yet decided the merits.

[3] The Parties filed similar papers and, what appears to be, the same settlement agreement in IPR2024-01420: (1) a "Joint Motion to Terminate *Inter Partes Review* [IPR] of U.S. Patent No. 11,562,402 Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.72" (Paper 35); (2) a true copy of the parties' settlement agreement (Ex. 1017); and (3) a "Joint Motion to Keep Confidential and Separate Under 35 U.S.C. § 317(B) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(C)" (Paper 36). Unless otherwise noted, we refer to the papers and settlement agreement filed in IPR2024-01316.

In the Joint Motion to terminate filed in IPR2024-01316, the parties state that "[they] have entered into a written confidential settlement agreement that fully resolves this matter." Mot. 2. There is a related district court case pending between the parties in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, but the parties represent that a "Stipulation of Dismissal [will] be filed concurrently with [the Joint Motion]." *Id.* at 3. The parties also represent that there is another related district court case pending in the Eastern District of Texas, but this case involves another party not involved in IR2024-01316—namely, Walmart, Inc. *Id.* Lastly, the parties represent that Exhibit 1030 "is a true and accurate copy of the agreement between the Parties" and it "represents the entire agreement or understanding between the Parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of [IPR2024-01316]." *Id.* at 2. The parties make essentially the same representations in IPR2024-01420. *See* IPR2024-01420, Paper 35.

Under these particular circumstances, we determine that it is appropriate to terminate both trials without rendering final written decisions. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.72. We also have reviewed the true copy of the parties' settlement agreements (IPR2024-01316, Ex. 1030; IPR2024-01420, Ex. 1017), and we determine that good cause exists to treat these settlement agreements as business confidential information and keep them separate from the files of the involved patents. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 317(b); 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

II. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the parties' Joint Requests to file their settlement agreements as business confidential information and keep them separate from the files of the involved patents are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Exhibit 1030 filed in IPR2024-01316 and Exhibit 1017 filed in IPR2024-01420 shall remain business confidential information, and shall be kept separate from the files of the involved patents; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' Joint Motions to terminate these IPRs are *granted*.

For PETITIONER

Jennifer Librach Nall
Safraz W. Ishmael
Joseph Wolfe
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
jennifer.nall@us.dlapiper.com
safraz.ishmael@us.dlapiper.com
joseph.wolfe@us.dlapiper.com

For PATENT OWNER

David L. Alberti
Sal Lim
Robert C. Mattson
KRAMER ALBERTI LIM & TONKOVICH LLP
dalberti@krameralberti.com
slim@krameralberti.com
rmattson@krameralberti.com

Jason A. Fitzsimmons
Richard M. Bemben
Steven M. Pappas
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
jfitzsimmons-PTAB@sternekessler.com
rbemben-PTAB@sternekessler.com
spappas-PTAB@sternekessler.com