

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BERKSHIRE HATHAWAY ENERGY COMPANY,
INTERSTATE POWER & LIGHT COMPANY,
MIDAMERICAN ENERGY COMPANY,
PACIFICORP,
WEC ENERGY GROUP, INC., AND
WISCONSIN POWER & LIGHT COMPANY,

Petitioners,

v.

BIRCHTECH CORP.,

Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2025-00423
U.S. Patent No. 10,668,430

**JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PROCEEDING AS TO
INTERSTATE POWER & LIGHT COMPANY AND
WISCONSIN POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

Petitioners Interstate Power and Light Company (“IPL”) and Wisconsin Power and Light Company (“WPL”) and Patent Owner Birchtech Corp., formerly known as Midwest Energy Emissions Corp. (“Patent Owner” or “ME2C”) (collectively, the “Settling Parties”), have reached and executed respective settlements. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(a), and the Board’s authorization via email on August 14, 2025, the Settling Parties jointly move to terminate the present *inter partes* review proceeding with respect to IPL and WPL, and dismiss IPL and WPL therefrom, as a result of the executed settlements between Patent Owner, IPL, and WPL. The other parties to this *inter partes* review proceeding (“IPR”), Petitioner constituents Berkshire Hathaway Energy Company, MidAmerican Energy Company, PacifiCorp, and WEC Energy Group, Inc. (collectively “the other Petitioner constituents”), do not object to dismissing IPL and WPL from this IPR. Patent Owner, IPL, and WPL further move to reconstitute the Petitioners of this IPR as Berkshire Hathaway Energy Company, MidAmerican Energy Company, PacifiCorp, and WEC Energy Group, Inc. alone.

IPL, WPL, and Patent Owner are filing concurrently herewith a request that the settlement agreements between IPL and Patent Owner (submitted as Ex. 1137) and between WPL and Patent Owner (submitted as Ex. 1138) be treated as business confidential information and be kept separate from the file of the involved patent, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). The settlement agreements

are being filed as “Available only to Board” to preserve the confidentiality of the agreements so that, *inter alia*, the other Petitioner constituents do not have access to those agreements.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

A joint motion to terminate generally “must (1) include a brief explanation as to why termination is appropriate; (2) identify all parties in any related litigation involving the patents at issue; (3) identify any related proceedings currently before the Office; and (4) discuss specifically the current status of each such related litigation or proceeding with respect to each party to the litigation or proceeding.” *Heartland Tanning, Inc. v. Sunless, Inc.*, IPR2014-00018, Paper 26, at *2 (July 28, 2014).

Patent Owner filed multiple lawsuits alleging infringement of U.S. Patent No. 10,668,430 (“’430 patent” or “challenged patent”) that have, ultimately, consolidated into multi-district litigation (“MDL”) in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa (*In Re: Midwest Energy Emissions Corp. Patent Litigation*, No. SDIA-4-24-md-03132).¹ This case is still pending before the

¹ Patent Owner also asserted the challenged patent in a case currently pending in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware (*Midwest Energy Emissions*

MDL Court. Parties to the MDL include MidAmerican Energy Corporation, Union Electric Co. d/b/a Ameren Missouri, PacifiCorp, Evergy Metro, Inc., Evergy Missouri West, Inc. and Evergy Kansas Central, Inc. Pursuant to the settlement agreements, IPL and WPL were recently dismissed as parties to the MDL. IPL and WPL, along with the Petitioner constituents listed in the caption and referenced above, also challenged the '430 patent in related IPR proceeding IPR2025-00422. Additionally, separate petitioners have challenged the '430 patent in another IPR proceeding, IPR 2025-01118 (*Union Electric Co. v. Birchtech Corp. f/k/a Midwest Energy Emissions Corp.*), filed June 6, 2025. There is no future litigation currently contemplated regarding the challenged patent other than the identified ongoing matters.

The Settling Parties have reached and executed respective final written agreements (the “IPL Agreement” and the “WPL Agreement””) to resolve their disputes.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b), the IPL Agreement and WPL Agreement are in writing, and true and correct copies are being filed as Exhibits 1137–38. The IPL and WPL Agreements are being filed electronically with access to “Board only.”

Corp., et al. v. Arthur J. Gallagher & Co., et al., C.A. 1:19-cv-01334). That litigation is ongoing.

A “Joint Request to File IPL and WPL Agreements as Business Confidential Information Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74” is being filed concurrently with this Joint Motion to Terminate Proceeding to treat the IPL and WPL Agreements as business confidential information and keep them separate from the files of the involved patent under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). The IPL and WPL Agreements contain confidential information of the Settling Parties.

II. TERMINATION IS APPROPRIATE

The Settling Parties request termination of this *inter partes* review and respectfully submit that such termination is justified. “There are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding.” Consolidated Trial Practice Guide 86 (Nov. 2019). “The Board expects that a proceeding will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement, unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding.” *Id.* (citing 35 U.S.C. § 317(a)). There are no other preconditions of 35 U.S.C. § 317(a). Under § 317(a), a decision on the merits is something beyond a decision instituting trial or a decision offering preliminary guidance.

The Board should terminate this proceeding in view of the Settling Parties’ joint request for the following reasons.

First, Acting Director Stewart referred this IPR to the Board for consideration of its merits on July 2, 2025. Petitioners also filed an authorized Reply to Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response on July 9, 2025. Patent Owner filed its Sur-Reply on July 23, 2025. Therefore, in this proceeding, no decision on the merits has been made to date; the present motion is being submitted prior to oral argument and a decision. Accordingly, the Settling Parties have met the statutory requirement that they file a “joint request” to terminate before the Office “has decided the merits of the proceeding.” 35 U.S.C. § 317(a).

Second, the Settling Parties have reached a settlement as to all disputes in this proceeding and as to the ’430 patent. A true copy of IPL and WPL Agreements are being filed concurrently herewith. *See* Confidential Exhibits 1137–38. No other such agreements, written or oral, exist between or among the Settling Parties relating to this proceeding. The Settling Parties thus satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 317(b).

Third, “[t]here are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding.” Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, November 2019, 86. “The Board expects that a proceeding will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement, unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding.” *Id.* (citing 35 U.S.C. §§317(a)). Termination would save further significant expenditure of resources by the Settling Parties and

the Board. Termination upon settlement would also further the purpose of *inter partes* review proceedings, which seek to provide an efficient and less costly alternative forum for patent disputes. Further, maintaining the proceeding would discourage further settlements, as patent owners in similar situations would have a strong disincentive to settle if they perceived that an *inter partes* review would continue regardless of settlement.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Settling Parties respectfully request termination of this *inter partes* review with respect to IPL and WPL.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 20, 2025

/ Michelle M. Kemp /

Michelle M. Kemp

Reg. No. 48,438

MKemp@perkinscoie.com

PERKINS COIE LLP

33 East Main Street, Suite 201

Madison, WI 53703-3095

Tel: (608) 663-7460

*Counsel for Petitioners Interstate
Power and Light and Wisconsin Power
and Light*

/ Hamad M. Hamad /

Hamad M. Hamad

Reg. No. 64,641

hhamad@caldwellcc.com

Caldwell, Cassady & Curry P.C.

2121 N. Pearl St., Ste 1200

Dallas, TX 75201

Tel: (214) 888-4848

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on August 20, 2025 a true copy of the **JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PROCEEDING and EXHIBITS 1137-38** was served upon the below listed counsel by electronic mail:

Hamad M. Hamad - hhamad@caldwellcc.com
Justin T. Nemunaitis - jnemunaitis@caldwellcc.com
Richard Cochrane - rcocchrane@caldwellcc.com
midwest@caldwellcc.com

Dated: August 20, 2025

By: / Michelle M. Kemp /
Michelle M. Kemp
Reg. No. 48,438
Lead Counsel for Petitioners Interstate
Power and Light and Wisconsin Power and
Light