

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

ORACLE CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

VIRTAMOVE, CORP.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00964 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-00965 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-00966 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-00981 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-00982 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-01001 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-01002 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)

Before COKE MORGAN STEWART, *Deputy Under Secretary of
Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the United
States Patent and Trademark Office.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

IPR2025-00964 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-00965 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-00966 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-00981 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-00982 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-01001 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-01002 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)

VirtaMove, Corp. (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 9, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Oracle Corporation (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 10, “DD Opp.”).¹

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.

Petitioner requests joinder of the above-captioned cases to other proceedings previously subject to discretionary denial of institution. For example, Petitioner requests joinder of IPR2025-00964, IPR2025-00965, IPR2025-00981, and IPR2025-00982 to proceedings denied institution in *Google, LLC v. Virtamove, Corp.*, IPR2025-00487, Paper 11 (Director July 11, 2025). *See* IPR2025-00964, Paper 4. Similarly, Petitioner requests joinder of IPR2025-00966, IPR2025-01001, and IPR2025-01002 to proceedings denied institution in *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Virtamove, Corp.*, IPR2025-00561, Paper 9 (Director July 11, 2025). *See* IPR2025-00966, Paper 4.

The above-captioned cases presents the same discretionary considerations at those presented in IPR2025-00487 and IPR2025-

¹ Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00964. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00965, IPR2025-00966, IPR2025-00981, IPR2025-00982, IPR2025-01001, and IPR2025-01002.

IPR2025-00964 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-00965 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-00966 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-00981 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-00982 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-01001 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-01002 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)

00561. *See, e.g.*, IPR2025-00487, Paper 9; IPR2025-00561, Paper

9. Accordingly, that analysis is incorporated here.

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.

IPR2025-00964 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-00965 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-00966 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-00981 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-00982 (Patent 7,784,058 B2)
IPR2025-01001 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)
IPR2025-01002 (Patent 7,519,814 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Bas de Blank
Parth Sagdeo
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
m2bptabdocket@orrick.com
ptabdocketp2s7@orrick.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Reza Mirzaie
Neil Rubin
James Milkey
Qi Tong
RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT
rmirzaie@raklaw.com
nrubin@raklaw.com
jmilkey@raklaw.com
ptong@raklaw.com