

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC and MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

MULTIFOLD INTERNATIONAL INCORPORATED PTE. LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00061
Patent 9,792,007 B2

Before KRISTEN L. DROESCH, HYUN J. JUNG, and
BRIAN P. MURPHY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

JUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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, Google LLC and Motorola Mobility LLC (collectively, “Petitioner”) and Multifold International Incorporated Pte. Ltd. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Joint Motion to Terminate due to settlement in the above-captioned proceeding. Paper 13 (“Joint Motion”). In support of the Joint Motion, Patent Owner filed confidential covenants not to sue (Exs. 2001, 2002 (“Settlement Agreements”)), as well as a Joint Request to File Settlement Agreement as Business Confidential Information (Paper 14 (“Joint Request”)) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74.

II. DISCUSSION

In the Joint Motion, Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively, “the Parties”) represent that they have resolved their dispute regarding U.S. Patent No. 9,792,007 B2 (Ex. 1001, “the ’007 patent”) including this proceeding and related district court litigation, and that the filed Settlement Agreements are true and correct copies of the Parties’ agreement and contain any and all agreements made in connection with or in contemplation of the requested termination. Joint Motion 1–2.

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 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) also provides that if no petitioner remains in the *inter partes* review, the Office may terminate the review.

We instituted trial in the above-captioned proceeding on May 21, 2025. Paper 7. We have not yet decided the merits of this proceeding, and a final written decision has not been entered. The Parties have shown

adequately that the termination of this proceeding is appropriate. Joint Motion 1. Under these circumstances, we determine that good cause exists to terminate this proceeding with respect to the Parties.

The Parties also filed the Joint Request that the Settlement Agreements be treated as business confidential information. Joint Request 1. After reviewing the Settlement Agreements between Petitioner and Patent Owner, we find that the Settlement Agreements contain confidential business information regarding the terms of settlement. We therefore determine that good cause exists to treat the Settlement Agreements between Petitioner and Patent Owner as business confidential information, to keep them separate from the file of the involved patent, and to limit their availability pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

In the Joint Request, the Parties request that the Settlement Agreements be “maintained separate from the publicly available file of the involved patent.” Joint Request 2. As stated above, and in accordance with rule 74(c), the Settlement Agreements will be kept separate from the file of the ’007 patent and will only be available to a Government agency on written request to the Board or to any other person upon written request to the Board on a showing of good cause.

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

III. ORDER

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is:

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

FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Request to treat Settlement

Agreements as business confidential information (Paper 14) is *granted*, and the Settlement Agreements (Exhibits 2001 and 2002) shall be kept separate from the file of U.S. Patent No. 9,792,007 B2 and made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

IPR2025-00061
Patent 9,792,007 B2

For PETITIONER:

Naveen Modi
Joseph E. Palys
Daniel Zeilberger
Quadeer Ahmed
David Valente
PAUL HASTINGS LLC
naveenmodi@paulhastings.com
josephpalys@paulhastings.com
danielzeilberger@paulhastings.com
quadeerahmed@paulhastings.com
davidvalente@paulhastings.com
PH-Google-Multifold-IPR@paulhastings.com

T. Vann Pierce, Jr.
Christopher J. Higgins
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
tvpptabdocket@orrick.com
0chptabdocket@orrick.com

For PATENT OWNER:

James T. Carmichael
Stephen Schreiner
Minghui Yang
Stephen McBride
Christopher R. Abidin
CARMICHAEL IP, PLLC
jim@carmichaelip.com
schreiner@carmichaelip.com
mitch@carmichaelip.com
stevenmcbride@carmichaelip.com
chris@carmichaelip.com
MultifoldsIPRs@carmichaelip.com