

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.

MOBILE DATA TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00535 (Patent 9,032,039 B2)
IPR2025-00536 (Patent 9,032,039 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>.

Mobile Data Technologies, 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. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 9, “DD Opp.”).²

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 for each of these cases is in September 2026. DD Req. 36. The district court’s scheduled trial date is April 20, 2026, and the time-to-trial statistics accord with this date. *Id.* at 35, 37. As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in these proceedings will issue before the district court trial occurs. Additionally, there is insufficient evidence that the district court is likely to stay its proceeding even if the Board were to institute trial. *Id.* at 32–34, 38–40.

Further, the challenged patents have been in force over ten 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).

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

² Unless indicated otherwise, citations are to papers in IPR2025-00535. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00536.

IPR2025-00535 (Patent 9,032,039 B2)

IPR2025-00536 (Patent 9,032,039 B2)

all of the evidence and arguments presented. Accordingly, the Petitions are denied under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner's requests for discretionary denial are *granted*; and

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

IPR2025-00535 (Patent 9,032,039 B2)

IPR2025-00536 (Patent 9,032,039 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Lori A. Gordon

Doug Kline

Naomi Birbach

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

Gordon-ptab@goodwinlaw.com

dkline@goodwinlaw.com

nbirbach@goodwinlaw.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Eugene Goryunov

Erick S. Robinson

Ian G. DiBernardo

Jayme Partridge

Jayne C. Piana

Homayoon Rafatijo

Patrick M. Dunn

BROWN RUDNICK LLP

egoryunov@brownrudnick.com

erobinson@brownrudnick.com

idibernardo@brownrudnick.com

jpartridge@brownrudnick.com

jpiana@brownrudnick.com

hrafatijo@brownrudnick.com

pdunn@brownrudnick.com