

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,

PETITIONER,

V.

ANONYMOUS MEDIA RESEARCH HOLDINGS, LLC,

PATENT OWNER.

Case No. IPR2025-00558
U.S. Patent No. 10,963,911

**PETITIONER AND PATENT OWNER'S JOINT MOTION TO
TERMINATE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 42.71(a)**

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 CFR § 42.71(a), Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”) and Patent Owner Anonymous Media Research Holdings, LLC (“Patent Owner”) (collectively, the “parties”) jointly request termination of this proceeding. This Joint Motion was authorized by the Board pursuant to e-mail correspondence on June 5, 2025. Ex. 3001.¹

Termination of this proceeding is proper because the Board has not yet issued any institution decision, Patent Owner has not yet filed any preliminary response, Petitioner has not yet filed any response to Patent Owner’s request for discretionary denial, and the parties have agreed that, in the interest of conserving party and Board resources, it is most prudent to terminate this proceeding. Petitioner has stipulated that it will not file another *inter partes* review petition challenging the validity of U.S. Patent No. 10,963,911. The parties further note that the ’911 patent will remain pending in the related district court action,

¹ As the parties represented in their joint email to the Board, this request to terminate the proceeding is not associated with a corresponding settlement agreement, nor are there any other collateral agreements or understandings made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this proceeding (besides Petitioner’s stipulation noted in the paragraph below).

Anonymous Media Research Holdings LLC v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al., No. 2:23-cv-00439 (E.D. Tex.).

Terminating the proceeding now would serve the interests of judicial economy by conserving resources of the Board as well as the mutual interest of the parties. Indeed, 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) provides that “[a]n inter partes review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed.” Here the Board has not even instituted the proceeding, much less decided the merits. Therefore, for all of these reasons, the parties respectfully request that their joint request be granted and IPR2025-00558 be terminated.

Dated: June 6, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Naveen Modi/
Naveen Modi (Reg. No. 46,224)
Counsel for Petitioner
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
2050 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-551-1700

/Stephen D. Zinda/
Stephen D. Zinda (Reg. No. 67,272)
Counsel for Patent Owner
CABELLO HALL ZINDA, PLLC
801 Travis, Suite 1610
Houston, TX 77002
Phone: 832-631-9991

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 6, 2025, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner and Patent Owner's Joint Motion to Terminate Pursuant to 37 CFR § 42.71(a) was served by electronic means upon the following:

Stephen D. Zinda (stephen@chzfirm.com)
James H. Hall (james@chzfirm.com)

paralegal@chzfirm.com

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 6, 2025

By: /Naveen Modi/

Naveen Modi (Reg. No. 46,224)
Counsel for Petitioner