

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

LAM RESEARCH CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

INPRIA CORP.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00256 (Patent 11,537,048 B2)
IPR2025-00309 (Patent 11,537,048 B2)

Before COKE MORGAN STEWART, *Acting Under Secretary of
Commerce for Intellectual Property and Acting Director of the United States
Patent and Trademark Office.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

Inpria Corp. (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 8, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Lam Research Corporation (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 11, “DD Opp.”).¹

After considering the parties’ arguments and the record, and in view of all relevant considerations, discretionary denial of institution is appropriate in these proceedings. This determination is based on the totality of the evidence and arguments the parties have presented.

In particular, the projected final written decision due date in the Board proceeding is August 12, 2026. DD Req. 10. The district court’s scheduled trial date is April 20, 2026. *Id.* at 9; Ex. 2001, 62. As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in this proceeding will issue before district court trial occurs. Furthermore, the parties have made meaningful investment in the district court proceeding. DD Req. 10–13. For example, the district court has held a *Markman* hearing and completion of fact discovery is scheduled to occur before the due date for an institution decision. *Id.* at 12–13.

Although certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is based on a holistic assessment of all of the evidence and arguments presented. Accordingly, the Petition is denied under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s request for discretionary denial is *granted*; and

¹ Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00256. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00309.

IPR2025-00256 (Patent 11,537,048 B2)

IPR2025-00309 (Patent 11,537,048 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that the Petition is *denied*, and no trial is instituted.

IPR2025-00256 (Patent 11,537,048 B2)

IPR2025-00309 (Patent 11,537,048 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Dion Bregman

Michael Lyons

Ahren Hsu-Hoffman

Alison Slaughter

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

dion.bregman@morganlewis.com

michael.lyons@morganlewis.com

ahren.hsu-hoffman@morganlewis.com

alison.patitucci@morganlewis.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Naveen Modi

Eric Dittmann

Isaac Ashkenazi

Phillip Citroen

Daniel Zeilberger

Michael Wolfe

Paul Anderson

Maksim Mints

PAUL HASTINGS LLP

naveenmodi@paulhastings.com

ericdittmann@paulhastings.com

isaacashkenazi@paulhastings.com

phillipcitroen@paulhastings.com

danielzeilberger@paulhastings.com

michaelwolfe@paulhastings.com

paulanderson@paulhastings.com

maksimmints@paulhastings.com