Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 20
Date: January 29, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION and
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ADVANCED CLUSTER SYSTEMS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00913 Patent 11,570,034 B2
IPR2025-00914 Patent 12,021,679 B2
IPR2025-00915 Patent 11,563,621 B2
IPR2025-00916 Patent 11,811,582 B2[1]

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, ARTHUR M. PESLAK, and BRIAN P. MURPHY, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

MURPHY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

TERMINATION
Due to Settlement After Institution of Trial
35 U.S.C. § 317; 37 C.F.R. § 42.74

I. INTRODUCTION

---

[1] We exercise our discretion to issue one Order that applies to each of the listed cases. The parties are not authorized to use this type of caption.

With authorization from the Board, Petitioner Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. ("Petitioner AMD") and Patent Owner Advanced Cluster Systems, Inc. ("Patent Owner") filed a Joint Motion to Terminate Proceedings as to Petitioner AMD due to settlement in the above-captioned proceedings. Paper 20 ("Joint Motion" or "Joint Mot.").[2] In support of the Joint Motion, Petitioner AMD and Patent Owner filed a confidential settlement agreement (Ex. 1162 ("Settlement Agreement")[3]), as well as a Joint Request to Treat Settlement Agreement as Business Confidential Information (Paper 19 ("Joint Request")) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74. Petitioner Intel Corporation remains in the proceedings as Petitioner. Joint Mot. 2.

II. DISCUSSION

In the Joint Motion, Petitioner AMD and Patent Owner represent that they have reached a settlement of all disputes between them relating to the four patents at issue in the above-referenced proceedings and that the filed Settlement Agreement (Ex. 1162) is a "true and correct copy" of their agreement, "represents all agreements made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this proceeding," and that "[a]ll such agreements have been filed with the Board as required by 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b)." Joint Motion 1–5.

---

[2] All citations are to Papers and Exhibits filed in IPR2025-00913, unless otherwise noted.

[3] The Joint Motion states that a true and correct copy of the Settlement Agreement "is being filed as Exhibit 1086," but the only agreement on file is Exhibit 1162. Joint Mot. 3. There is no Exhibit 1086 on file in the P-TACTS docket system for any of the four cases. If there is any other related agreement between Petitioner AMD and Patent Owner, the parties must notify the Board and file such agreement immediately.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 317(a), "[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."

We instituted trial in the above-captioned proceedings on November 7, 2025 (IPR2025-00913, Paper 16), November 10, 2025 (IPR2025-00916, Paper 15), November 12, 2025 (IPR2025-00914, Paper 16), and November 19, 2025 (IPR2025-00915, Paper 15). We have not yet decided the merits of any of these proceedings, and final written decisions have not been entered. Petitioner AMD and Patent Owner have shown that the termination of this proceeding as to Petitioner AMD is appropriate. Under these circumstances, we determine that good cause exists to terminate this proceeding as to Petitioner AMD.

After reviewing the Settlement Agreement between Petitioner AMD and Patent Owner, we find that the Settlement Agreement contains confidential business information regarding the terms of settlement. We determine that good cause exists to treat the Settlement Agreement between Petitioner AMD and Patent Owner as business confidential information pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

This Order does not constitute a final written decision pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 318(a).

III. ORDER

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is:

ORDERED that the Joint Motions filed in the above-captioned proceedings are *granted*, and the above-captioned proceedings are *terminated as to Petitioner AMD only*, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R.

§ 42.72;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Request to treat the Settlement Agreement as business confidential information filed in the above-captioned proceedings is *granted*, and the Settlement Agreement (Exhibit 1162) shall be kept separate from the files of the patents at issue in the above-captioned proceedings and made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c);

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner Intel Corporation remains as a Petitioner in the above-captioned proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner Intel Corporation and Patent Owner Advanced Cluster Systems, Inc. shall not list Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. as a named petitioner in the caption in all subsequent filings in the above-captioned proceedings.

For PETITIONER:

Andrew Ehmke
David McCombs
Dan Smith
Dagim Tilahun
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
andy.ehmke.ipr@haynesboone.com
david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com
dan.smith.ipr@haynesboone.com
dagim.tilahun.ipr@haynesboone.com

Brian Ferguson
Chaoxuan Liu
James Kappos
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP

IPR2025-00913 (Patent 11,570,034 B2)
IPR2025-00914 (Patent 12,021,679 B2)
IPR2025-00915 (Patent 11,563,621 B2)
IPR2025-00916 (Patent 11,811,582 B2)

beferguson@winston.com
ccliu@winston.com
jkappos@winston.com

For PATENT OWNER:

David Lindner
Jon Gurka
CROWELL & MORING, LLP
dlindner@crowell.com
jgurka@crowell.com

Reynaldo Barcelo
BARCELO, HARRISON & WALKER, LLP
rey@bhiplaw.com