Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper No. 27
Entered: May 11, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

KANGXI COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES
(SHANGHAI) CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

SKYWORKS SOLUTIONS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01456 (Patent 9,450,579 B2)
IPR2024-01457 (Patent 9,148,194 B2)[1]

Before JON M. JURGOVAN, AMBER L. HAGY, and
STEPHEN E. BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HAGY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

---

[1] This Order addresses issues that are the same in the identified cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this filing style in subsequent papers.

I. INTRODUCTION

On May 4, 2026, with Board authorization, Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively "the Parties") filed a Joint Motion to Terminate pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74 in each of the above-captioned proceedings. Paper 27 ("Joint Motion")[2]. Along with the Joint Motion, the Parties filed a copy of a Joint Motion to Terminate the Investigation filed in the related ITC proceeding (Ex. 2007) and a Joint Motion to Dismiss the related district court proceeding (Ex. 2008), together with the Orders granting those motions (Ex. 2009 and Ex. 2010), and an email exchange reflecting the Parties' agreement to jointly terminate the above-captioned proceedings (Ex. 2006) (collectively, "Joint Agreement"). In the Joint Motion, the Parties represent that the Joint Agreement is a true and correct copy of their agreement. Joint Motion 4. The Parties further represent that "there are no other agreements, oral or written, between the Parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this proceeding." *Id.*

The Board generally expects that a case "will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement, unless the Board has already decided the merits." *Consolidated Trial Practice Guide*, 86 (Nov. 2019)[3]; *see* 35 U.S.C. §317(a); 37 C.F.R. § 42.72. Here, although the Board instituted *inter partes* review of the challenged patents, the Board has not yet entered a decision deciding the merits of these proceedings. Under these circumstances, therefore,

---

[2] We refer to Papers and Exhibits filed in IPR2024-01456. The Parties filed similar documents in IPR2024-01457.

[3] Available at https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated.

we determine that it is appropriate to terminate these proceedings as to the Parties, without rendering a final written decision.

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

II. ORDER

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is:

ORDERED that the Joint Motions to Terminate are *granted*, and the above-identified proceedings are *terminated*.

FOR PETITIONER:

Christopher Tyson
Patrick McPherson
Daniel Mitchell
DUANE MORRIS LLP
cjtyson@duanemorris.com
pdmcpherson@duanemorris.com
dmitchell@duanemorris.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Haixia Lin
Jungyeon Kim
Daniel Perry
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING, HALE AND DORR, LLP
Haixia.Lin@wilmerhale.com
john.kim@wilmerhale.com
danny.perry@wilmerhale.com