

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

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,  
SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR, INC., and  
SAMSUNG AUSTIN SEMICONDUCTOR LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

W&WSENS DEVICES INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2025-00995 (Patent 10,468,543 B2)  
IPR2025-00996 (Patent 10,446,700 B2)

---

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE,<sup>1</sup> *Acting Chief Administrative  
Patent Judge.*

DECISION  
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

---

<sup>1</sup> Coke Morgan Stewart, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, is recused and took no part in this decision. See <https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/dsco-delegation.pdf>.

IPR2025-00995 (Patent 10,468,543 B2)  
IPR2025-00996 (Patent 10,446,700 B2)

W&Wsens Devices Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 10, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., Samsung Semiconductor, Inc., and Samsung Austin Semiconductor LLC (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 11, “DD Opp.”).<sup>2</sup> With authorization, Patent Owner filed a Reply (Paper 14), and Petitioner filed a Sur-reply (Paper 15).

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 projected final written decision due date in the Board proceedings is December 24, 2026. DD Req. 12. The district court trial is scheduled to begin August 3, 2026, and time-to-trial statistics suggest trial could begin between August 2026 and early December 2026. *Id.* at 12–13; DD Opp. 15. As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in these proceedings 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. This favors discretionary denial.

Additionally, the challenged patents have been in force for approximately six years, creating settled expectations for Patent Owner. Further, Patent Owner provides evidence demonstrating Petitioner was aware of the challenged patents as early as 2020. Ex. 2001; Ex. 2002; Ex. 2003; Ex. 2004. This further favors discretionary denial.

---

<sup>2</sup> Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00995. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00996.

IPR2025-00995 (Patent 10,468,543 B2)

IPR2025-00996 (Patent 10,446,700 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.

IPR2025-00995 (Patent 10,468,543 B2)

IPR2025-00996 (Patent 10,446,700 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Joshua Goldberg

Benjamin Saidman

Abhay Watwe

Biju Chandran

Kai Rajan

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP

joshua.goldberg@finnegan.com

benjamin.saidman@finnegan.com

abhay.watwe@finnegan.com

biju.chandran@finnegan.com

kai.rajan@finnegan.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

James Hannah

Jeffrey Price

Jenna Fuller

Jeffrey Eng

HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS KRAMER

james.hannah@hsfkramer.com

jeffrey.price@hsfkramer.com

jenna.fuller@hsfkramer.com

jeffrey.eng@hsfkramer.com