

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.

CERENCE OPERATING COMPANY,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00457
Patent 7,680,334 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>.

Cerence Operating Company (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 10, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned case, and Samsung Electronics, Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively “Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 11, “DD Opp.”).

After considering the parties’ arguments and the record, and in view of all relevant considerations, discretionary denial of institution is appropriate in this proceeding. 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 October 8, 2026. The district court’s scheduled trial date is April 20, 2026. DD Req. 6. As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in this proceeding will issue before the district court trial occurs, resulting in significant duplication of effort, additional expense for the parties, and a risk of inconsistent decisions. Additionally, there is insufficient evidence that the district court is likely to stay its proceeding even if the Board were to institute trial. DD Opp. 1–2. These considerations favor discretionary denial.

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

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

IPR2025-00457
Patent 7,680,334 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Ali Sharifahmadian
Patrick Reidy
Douglas Clark
Albert Boardman
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
ali.sharifahmadian@arnoldporter.com
patrick.reidy@arnoldporter.com
douglas.clark@arnoldporter.com
albert.boardman@arnoldporter.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Qi Tong
Neil A. Rubin
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT
ptong@raklaw.com
nrubin@raklaw.com