

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

LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC. and
MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

COLLISION COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00927
Patent 7,593,492 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

Collision Communications, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 7, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned case, and Lenovo (United States) Inc. and Motorola Mobility LLC (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 8, “DD Opp.”).

After considering the parties’ arguments and the record, and in view of all relevant considerations, discretionary denial of institution is appropriate in this proceeding. 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 in the Board proceeding is November 23, 2026. DD Req. 12. The district court’s scheduled trial date is January 5, 2026, and time-to-trial statistics show trial would begin in April 2026. *Id.* at 2. Therefore, it is unlikely that a final written decision in this proceeding will issue before the district court trial occurs, resulting in significant duplication of effort, additional expense for the parties, and a risk of inconsistent decisions.

Additionally, the challenged patent has been in force for approximately 16 years, creating strong settled expectations for Patent Owner. Further, the challenged patent in this proceeding was the subject of a previous *inter partes* review, and the Board denied institution on the merits. *Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc. v. Collision Comm’s, Inc.*, IPR2024-01247, Paper 14 (PTAB Feb. 7, 2025). Repeat challenges raise concerns of road mapping and weigh against institution.

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 Petition is denied under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner's request for discretionary denial is *granted*; and

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

IPR2025-00927
Patent 7,593,492 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Timothy Riffe
Jennifer Huang
Cameron Ubel
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
riffe@fr.com
jjh@fr.com
ubel@fr.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

William Meunier
Michael Renaud
Kevin Amendt
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C.
wameunier@mintz.com
mtrenaud@mintz.com
kcamendt@mintz.com