UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

Petitioner,

v.

SECURITY TECHNOLOGY, LLC,

Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No.: IPR2024-01420

U.S. Patent No. 11,562,402

JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE *INTER PARTES* REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 11,562,402 UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.72

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(a) Petitioner Home Depot USA, Inc. and Patent Owner SECURITY TECHNOLOGY, LLC jointly request termination of the *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 11,562,402 (the "'402 Patent") in IPR2024-01420. On October 21, 2025, the Parties informed the Board of a settlement agreement between Petitioner and Patent Owner via email and requested authorization to file a Joint Motion to Terminate the proceeding with respect to both the Patent Owner and Petitioner. As set forth in an email dated October 22, 2025, the Board authorized the filing of the requested Joint Motion to Terminate. Accordingly, Petitioner and Patent Owner jointly request termination of the present proceeding.

II. ARGUMENT

A joint motion to terminate generally must "(1) include a brief explanation as to why termination is appropriate; (2) identify all parties in any related litigation involving the patents at issue; (3) identify any related proceedings currently before the Office; and (4) discuss specifically the current status of each such related litigation or proceeding with respect to each party to the litigation or proceeding." *Heartland Tanning, Inc. v. Sunless, Inc.*, IPR2014-00018, Paper 26 at 2 (PTAB Jul. 28, 2014).

A. Brief Explanation as to Why Termination Is Appropriate

Petitioner and Patent Owner have entered into a written confidential settlement agreement that fully resolves this matter. The Parties are concurrently filing a copy of the settlement agreement as Exhibit 1017 along with a request to treat it as business confidential information pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b), the Parties acknowledge, as of the filing of this Motion and the concurrent Motion to Keep Confidential, that Exhibit 1017 represents the entire agreement or understanding between the Parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this proceeding, and further, that Exhibit 1017 is a true and accurate copy of the agreement between the Parties that resolves the present proceeding. The Parties agree that neither Patent Owner nor Petitioner will be prejudiced by termination of this proceeding.

The Parties "may terminate the proceeding…unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding." Consolidated Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, at 4 (November 2019). This proceeding is still at an early stage. Petitioner has yet to file its Petitioner Reply, and Patent Owner has yet to file its Patent Owner Sur-reply. The Parties have now settled their dispute and have reached agreement to terminate the Petition.

Termination is appropriate because public policy favors terminating the present petition for *inter partes* review. Congress and federal courts have expressed

a strong interest in encouraging settlement in litigation. *Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August*, 450 U.S. 346, 352 (1981) ("The purpose of [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 68 is to encourage the settlement of litigation."); *Bergh v. Dept. of Transp.*, 794 F.2d 1575, 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1986) ("The law favors settlement of cases."), *cert. denied*, 479 U.S. 950 (1986). The Federal Circuit places a particularly strong emphasis on settlement. *Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe v. U.S.*, 806 F.2d 1046, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (noting that the law favors settlement to reduce antagonism and hostility between parties). The Board's Trial Practice Guide stresses that "[t]here are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding." Consolidated Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, at 86 (Nov. 2019).

B. Identification of Parties and Status of Litigation

The '402 Patent is subject to the following actions:

- *Ravenwhite Licensing LLC v. The Home Depot, Inc., et al.*, No. 2:24-cv-00688 (E.D. Tex. filed Aug. 21, 2024)—Stipulation of Dismissal to be filed concurrently with this motion.
- *Ravenwhite Licensing LLC v. Walmart Inc.*, No. 3:24-cv-00689 (E.D. Tex. filed Aug. 21, 2024)—case is still pending.

C. Identification and Status of Related Proceedings Before the USPTO

Petitioner has not filed any further Petition for *Inter Partes* Review related to the ’402 Patent. Petitioner’s reply in IPR2024-01420 is due on November 15, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 27, 2025

By: /*Jennifer Librach Nall*/
Jennifer Librach Nall
Reg. No. 57,053
Counsel for Petitioner

By: /*Steven M. Pappas*/
Steven M. Pappas
Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox PLLC
1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6, I hereby certify that I caused a true and correct copy of this **JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE INTER PARTES REVIEW OF U.S. PATENT NO. 11,562,402 UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.72** in connection with IPR2024-01420 to be served via e-mail on October 27, 2025, in its entirety on the following counsel of record for Patent Owner:

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

David L. Alberti
Sal Lim
Robert C. Mattson
Ryan K. Dooley
Kramer Alberti Lim & Tonkovich LLP
dalberti@krameralberti.com
slim@krameralberti.com
rmattson@krameralberti.com
rdooley@krameralberti.com

Dated: October 27, 2025

By: /*Jennifer Librach Nall*/
Jennifer Librach Nall
Reg. No. 57,053
Counsel for Petitioner