Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov
571.272.7822

Paper 17
Date: October 15, 2025

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

MURATA MANUFACTURING CO., LTD,
Petitioner,

v.

GEORGIA TECH RESEARCH CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00383 (Patent 7,489,914 B2)
IPR2025-00384 (Patent 7,489,914 B2)[1]

Before JOHN A. SQUIRES, *Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

ORDER

[1] This order applies to each of the above-listed proceedings.

The Office received a request for Director Review of the Decision denying institution ("Decision") in each of the above-captioned cases from Murata Manufacturing Co., Ltd ("Petitioner"), and an authorized response to each request from Georgia Tech Research Corporation ("Patent Owner"). *See* Papers 15, 16.[2] After considering the requests and responses, the Director Review requests are denied.

The Decision denied institution based on a holistic assessment of all of the evidence and arguments presented, including Patent Owner's strong settled expectations and Petitioner's failure to seek early review of the challenged patent. *See* Decision 2–3. Petitioner essentially reargues the position presented in its discretionary briefing, *see* Paper 15, which was not found to be persuasive there. It is not persuasive here.

Moreover, even if Petitioner's arguments were persuasive, there are additional factors not highlighted in the original discretionary denial decision that counsel in favor of denial. Those considerations include the need for extensive discovery from a foreign entity in Japan, discovery practice outside the United States, third-party discovery, and translation of foreign language documents, all to develop evidence of objective indicia of nonobviousness. Paper 9, 22–24. In cases such as this, the district court is the more appropriate venue to adjudicate obviousness.

In view of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that the requests for Director Review are denied.

---

[2] Citations are to the record in IPR2025-00383. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00384.

FOR PETITIONER:

David O'Brien
Kelly Lyle
Greg Michelson
Hong Shi
HAYNES AND BOONE LLP
david.obrien.ipr@haynesboone.com
kelly.lyle.ipr@haynesboone.com
greg.michelson.ipr@haynesboone.com
hong.shi.ipr@haynesboone.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Warren J. Thomas
Gregory J. Carlin
Lee G. Hamilton
Samuel V.B. Fritz
MEUNIER CARLIN & CURFMAN LLC
wthomas@mcciplaw.com
gcarlin@mcciplaw.com
lhamilton@mcciplaw.com
sfritz@mcciplaw.com