

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

ANALOG DEVICES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NUMBER 14 B.V.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00550 (Patent 7,973,596 B2)
IPR2025-00551 (Patent 7,812,665 B2)

Before COKE MORGAN STEWART, *Acting Under Secretary of
Commerce for Intellectual Property and Acting Director of the United States
Patent and Trademark Office.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

Number 14 B.V. (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 6, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned case, and Analog Devices, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 7, “DD Opp.”).¹ With authorization, Patent Owner filed a reply (Paper 8) and Petitioner filed a sur-reply (Paper 9).

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 challenged patents have been in force for more than 13 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).

Furthermore, Patent Owner presents evidence that Petitioner’s real party in interest (and now wholly owned subsidiary²) controlled prosecution of and maintained the involved patents, and paid “millions of dollars in royalties.” DD Req. 18–19; Ex. 2002 ¶ 88; Ex. 2001 § 2.2; Paper 1, *iv* (identifying Maxim Integrated Products, Inc. as a real party in interest). It is not an appropriate use of Office resources where a party or its real party in interest applied for and was issued a patent, but, as is the case here, now advocates for its unpatentability.

¹ Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00550. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00551.

² Petitioner acquired Maxim Integrated Products in August 2021 and Maxim Integrated Products became a wholly owned subsidiary of Petitioner. Ex. 2002 ¶ 6.

IPR2025-00550 (Patent 7,973,596 B2)

IPR2025-00551 (Patent 7,812,665 B2)

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 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.

IPR2025-00550 (Patent 7,973,596 B2)

IPR2025-00551 (Patent 7,812,665 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Christopher Centurelli

Erik Halverson

Joshua Andrews

K&L GATES LLP

christopher.centurelli@klgates.com

erik.halverson@klgates.com

joshua.andrews@klgates.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Warren Thomas

Lee Hamilton

Samuel Fritz

MEUNIER CARLIN & CURFMAN LLC

wthomas@mcciplaw.com

lhamilton@mcciplaw.com

sfritz@mcciplaw.com