

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DATABRICKS, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

BYTEWEAVR, LLC.,
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review Case No. IPR2025-00716
U.S. Patent No. 8,275,827

**JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE *INTER PARTES* REVIEW
PROCEEDINGS**

UPDATED PETITIONER’S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 8,275,827
1002	File History of U.S. Patent No. 8,275,827
1003	Declaration of Dr. John D. Kubiawicz, Ph.D. (“Kubiawicz Decl.”)
1004	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. John D. Kubiawicz, Ph.D
1005	International Application WO 98/22881 to Carter et al., titled Remote Access in a Globally Addressable Storage Environment,” published on May 28, 1998 (“Carter”)
1006	Kubiawicz, John et al., “OceanStore: An Architecture for Global-Scale Persistent Storage,” stamped November 20, 2000 by the University of Michigan, and appearing in ASPLOS-IX proceedings: Ninth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Cambridge, Mass., Nov. 12-15, 2000 (pp. 190-201) (“OceanStore”)
1007	Garth A. Gibson et al., File Server Scaling with Network-Attached Secure Disks (“Gibson”)
1008	Morris, et al., “Andrew, a Distributed Personal Computing Environment”
1009	Satyanarayanan et al., “The ITC Distributed Filed System: Principles and Design”
1010	Litzkow, et al., “Condor – A Hunter of Idle Workstations”
1011	Chien, “The Grid, Blueprint for a New Computing Infrastructure”
1012	Plank, et al., “The Internet Backplane Protocol: Storage in the Network”
1013	Bloom, “Space/Time Trade-offs in Hash Coding with Allowable Errors”
1014	Champine, et al., “Project Athena as a Distributed Computer System”

Exhibit	Description
1015	Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement in <i>Byteweavr, LLC v. Databricks, Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00162-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.) (dkt. entry 55)
1016	Exhibit A to Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement in <i>Byteweavr, LLC v. Databricks, Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00162-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.) (dkt. entry 55-1)
1017	Exhibit B to Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement in <i>Byteweavr, LLC v. Databricks, Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00162-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.) (dkt. entry 55-2)
1018	Plaxton et al., “Accessing Nearby Copies of Replicated Objects in a Distributed Environment,” appearing in <i>Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Parallelism in Algorithms and Architecture</i> (SPAA), June 1997
1019	IPR2017-00374, Paper 53 (Final Written Decision)
1020	IPR2017-00439, Paper 50 (Final Written Decision)
1021	Declaration of Rachel J. Watters
1022	Docket Control Order in <i>Byteweavr, LLC v. Databricks, Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00162-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.)
1023	Docket in <i>Byteweavr, LLC v. Databricks, Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00162-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.) (retrieved March 13, 2025)
1024	Confidential Settlement Agreement Exhibit
1025	Order Dismissing Case with Prejudice, <i>Byteweavr, LLC v. Databricks, Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00162-JRG-RSP (E.D. Tex.) (dkt. entry 73)

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.71(a) 42.72 and the Board’s authorization by email dated June 30, 2025, Petitioner Databricks, Inc. (“Petitioner”) and Patent Owner ByteWeavr, LLC (“Patent Owner”) move to terminate the instant *Inter Partes* Review concerning U.S. Patent No. 8,275,827 (“the ’827 Patent”) and thereby terminate IPR2025-00716. Termination of the instant proceeding will preserve the resources of the Board and the parties.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On March 8, 2024, Patent Owner asserted the ’827 Patent against Petitioner in the action entitled *ByteWeavr, LLC v. Databricks, Inc.*, No. 2:24-cv-00162 (E.D. Tex., Mar. 8, 2024) (the “Litigation”). In response, Petitioners filed the instant petition for *inter partes* review challenging claims 2, 10-12, 14, and 22-24 of the ’827 Patent, which was accorded a filing date of March 13, 2025. *Databricks, Inc. v. ByteWeavr, LLC*, IPR2025-00716, Paper 3 (P.T.A.B. April 15, 2025).

Petitioner and Patent Owner have reached an agreement (the “Settlement Agreement”) to resolve their disputes. On June 18, 2025, the District Court granted the Parties’ joint motion to dismiss, thereby terminating the Litigation. Ex. 1025.

Additionally, Petitioners have simultaneously filed similarly unopposed motions to terminate in *Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2025-00714 of U.S. Patent No.

Case IPR2025-00716
Motion to Terminate IPR Proceedings
6,839,733 and *Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2025-00715 of U.S. Patent No.
7,949,752.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b), the Settlement Agreement is in writing, and a true and correct copy is included in Ex. 1024 (hereinafter “Settlement Agreement Exhibit”). The Settlement Agreement Exhibit is being filed electronically with access to “Board and Parties Only.” A “*Joint Request to File Settlement Agreement 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, to treat the Settlement Agreement Exhibit as business confidential information and to keep it separate from the files of the involved patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

III. ARGUMENT

Good cause exists to grant Petitioners’ Motion pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.71(a) and 42.72. IPR2025-00716 remains at the earliest procedural stage: Patent Owner has not submitted a POPR, and the Board has not reached a decision on institution. Notably, Patent Owner does not oppose this Motion to withdraw the Petition.

As the Board has recognized, early termination—particularly when unopposed—promotes efficiency and substantially conserves the Board’s and parties’ resources. *Reolink Digital Technology Co., Ltd. v. KT Imaging USA, LLD*,

IPR2024-01154, Paper 6, 2 (P.T.A.B. Sep. 23, 2024) (“determin[ing] that it is appropriate to grant Petitioner’s Motion to withdraw the Petitions and terminate the proceedings” where “Patent Owner ... does not oppose the withdrawal of the Petition” and “proceeding[s] are in their preliminary stages, and no decisions on whether to institute *inter partes* review have been made.”); *see also DirectTV, LLC v. Entropic Communications, LLC*, IPR2024-01063, Paper 8, 2-3 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 17, 2024).

Further, termination of the instant IPR is appropriate because all pending disputes between the parties concerning the ’827 Patent have been resolved in the district court litigation, and the concurrent litigation has been dismissed. Ex. 1025. Under such circumstances, withdrawal serves the interests of the parties and the Board and furthers the objectives of 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b) in “secur[ing] the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding.”

IV. CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that the Board grant this Motion to Terminate the above-captioned IPR and thereby terminate the instant IPR proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robin A. Snader
Robin A. Snader, Reg. No. 66,085
Erise IP, P.A.

Motion to Terminate IPR Proceedings

7015 College Boulevard, Suite 700

Overland Park, KS 66211

robin.snader@eriseip.com

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

/s/ Terry A. Saad

Terry A. Saad Reg. No. 62,492

Bragalone Olejko Saad PC

901 Main Street, Suite 3800

Dallas, TX 75202

tsaad@bosfirm.com

COUNSEL FOR PATENT OWNER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the above-captioned “JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE *INTER PARTES* REVIEW PROCEEDINGS” was served in its entirety on July 15, 2025, by filing this document through the Patent Trial and Appeal Case Tracking System as well as delivering a copy via electronic mail upon the following attorneys of record for the Patent Owner:

Terry A. Saad (tsaad@bosfirm.com)
Marcus Benavides (mbenavides@bosfirm.com)
Vivek Ramachandran (vramachandran@bosfirm.com)

By: /s/ Robin A. Snader
Robin A. Snader, Reg. No. 66,085

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER