

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

SIONYX, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01431
Patent 11,069,737 B2

Before GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, MONICA S. ULLAGADDI, and
BRIAN D. RANGE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

RANGE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Motion to Withdraw
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

I. INTRODUCTION

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–29 and 31–55 of U.S. Patent No. 11,069,737 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’737 patent”). Paper 1 (“Pet.”). SiOnyx, LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a Preliminary Response. Paper 11 (“Prelim. Resp.”). With our authorization (Exs. 3001, 3002), Patent Owner filed a Supplemental Submission regarding *Fintiv* discretionary denial (Paper 14, “PO *Fintiv* Supp.”), Petitioner filed a Response (Paper 17, “Pet. *Fintiv* Resp.”), and Patent Owner filed a Surreply (Paper 18, “PO *Fintiv* SurReply”).

Patent Owner disclaimed claims 1, 7–27, 29–32, and 38–55 of the ’737 patent. Prelim. Resp. 1 (citing Ex. 2002; Ex. 2003). In view of this disclaimer, claims 2–6, 28, and 33–37 of the ’737 patent (the “challenged claims”) remain at issue.

Petitioner then requested authorization to file an unopposed motion to withdraw a specific challenge in IPR2024-01431. Via email, we authorized the parties to file a motion to withdraw grounds. Ex. 3002. On April 1, 2025, the parties filed a “Joint Motion to Withdraw Ground A-3.” Paper 19 (“Mot.”). Ground A-3 asserts claims 16, 32–42, 44–46, 48, 49, 52, and 55 are obvious based on Haddad¹ and Jiang². Pet. 6.

II. ANALYSIS

The parties submit that, if *inter partes* review is instituted, “[n]either party will be permitted to discuss this ground [Ground A-3] at oral argument

¹ US 2011/0227138 A1, published September 22, 2011, Ex. 1012 (“Haddad138”).

² WO 2012/122572, published Sep. 13, 2012, Ex. 1008 (“Jiang”).

and the parties agree that it not be addressed in the Final Written Decision.”

Mot. 1. The parties further represent “this agreement shall have no impact on other grounds.” *Id.*

Withdrawal of Ground A-3 will streamline issues for trial, thereby furthering efficient and just resolution of this proceeding. Also, this matter is at a very early stage (before institution). Accordingly, the parties have shown good cause for withdrawing Ground A-3.

III. CONCLUSION

Because the parties have shown good cause, we grant the parties’ motion to withdraw Ground A-3. Withdrawal of Ground A-3 means that we consider the ground to be removed from the Petition. If we issue a final written decision under 35 U.S.C. § 318(a) in this proceeding, we will consider the withdrawn grounds not “challenged by the petitioner.”

IV. ORDER

For the foregoing reasons, it is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion to Withdraw Grounds is *granted*.

IPR2024-01431
Patent 11,069,737 B2

For PETITIONER:

Scott Weidenfeller
Nitin Subhedar
Juwon Ahn
sweidenfeller@cov.com
nsubhedar@cov.com
aahn@cov.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Alison McCarthy
Dustin Ferzacca
alison.mccarthy@troutman.com
dustin.ferzacca@troutman.com