

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

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SINOTECHNIX LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00331 (Patent 7,618,162 B1)
IPR2025-00333 (Patent 7,748,873 B2)
IPR2025-00335 (Patent 8,132,952 B2)
IPR2025-00336 (Patent 7,901,113 B2)

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE,¹ *Acting Deputy Chief Administrative
Patent Judge.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

¹ Coke Morgan Stewart, Acting Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Acting Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, is recused and took no part in this decision. The Acting Director has delegated her authority in a Notice of Delegation. *See* <https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/deshpande-delegation-letter.pdf>

IPR2025-00331 (Patent 7,618,162 B1)
IPR2025-00333 (Patent 7,748,873 B2)
IPR2025-00335 (Patent 8,132,952 B2)
IPR2025-00336 (Patent 7,901,113 B2)

Sinotechnix LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 8, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 10, “DD Opp.”).² With authorization, Petitioner filed a Supplemental Brief (Paper 11) and Patent Owner filed a Reply to the Supplemental Brief (Paper 12).

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 proceedings is September 6, 2026. DD Req. 8. The district court’s scheduled trial date is May 4, 2026. *Id.* at 7-8. As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in these proceedings will issue before district court trial occurs. Additionally, the challenged patents have been in force for more than 10 years, creating strong settled expectations, and Petitioner does not provide any persuasive reasoning why an *inter partes* review is an appropriate use of Board resources. *Dabico Airport Sols. Inc. v. Axa Power Aps*, IPR2025-00408, Paper 21 at 2–3 (Director June 18, 2025); *Intel Corp. v. Proxense LLC*, IPR2025-00327, Paper 12, 2–3 (Director June 26, 2025).

Although certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is based on a holistic assessment of

² Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00331. The parties filed similar papers in the other cases.

IPR2025-00331 (Patent 7,618,162 B1)
IPR2025-00333 (Patent 7,748,873 B2)
IPR2025-00335 (Patent 8,132,952 B2)
IPR2025-00336 (Patent 7,901,113 B2)

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

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

FOR PETITIONER:

Yung-Hoon Ha
Laura Avena
Taeg Sang Cho
DESMARAIS LLP
tcho@desmaraisllp.com
yha@desmaraisllp.com
ybao@desmaraisllp.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Brandon Moore
David DeZern
NELSON BUMGARDNER CONROY P.C.
brandon@nelbum.com
david@nelbum.com