

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. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GENGHISCOMM HOLDINGS LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00788 (Patent 10,389,568 B1)
IPR2025-00789 (Patent 11,075,786 B1)
IPR2025-00790 (Patent 11,223,508 B1)
IPR2025-00791 (Patent 11,252,005 B1)
IPR2025-00792 (Patent 11,381,285 B1)
IPR2025-00793 (Patent 11,424,792 B2)

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE,¹ *Acting Deputy Chief Administrative
Patent Judge.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

¹ Coke Morgan Stewart, Acting Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Acting Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, is recused and took no part in this decision. The Acting Director has delegated her authority in a Notice of Delegation. *See* <https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/deshpande-delegation-letter.pdf>.

IPR2025-00788 (Patent 10,389,568 B1)
IPR2025-00789 (Patent 11,075,786 B1)
IPR2025-00790 (Patent 11,223,508 B1)
IPR2025-00791 (Patent 11,252,005 B1)
IPR2025-00792 (Patent 11,381,285 B1)
IPR2025-00793 (Patent 11,424,792 B2)

GenghisComm Holdings, LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed requests for discretionary denial (Paper 8, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed oppositions (Paper 10, “DD Opp.”).²

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.

This case presents essentially the same discretionary considerations at those presented in IPR2025-00780 and IPR2025-00781. *See, e.g., Samsung Electronics Co. v. GhengisComm Holdings LLC*, IPR2025-00780, Paper 11 (Director August 14, 2025) (granting Patent Owner’s request for discretionary denial). Accordingly, that analysis is incorporated here. *Id.* at 2–3. Although the patents challenged in these proceedings have not been in force for as long as those in IPR2025-00780 and IPR2025-00781, this fact alone does not tip the balance against discretionary denial.

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:

² Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00788. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00789, IPR2025-00790, IPR2025-00791, IPR2025-00792, and IPR2025-00793.

IPR2025-00788 (Patent 10,389,568 B1)
IPR2025-00789 (Patent 11,075,786 B1)
IPR2025-00790 (Patent 11,223,508 B1)
IPR2025-00791 (Patent 11,252,005 B1)
IPR2025-00792 (Patent 11,381,285 B1)
IPR2025-00793 (Patent 11,424,792 B2)

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

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

IPR2025-00788 (Patent 10,389,568 B1)
IPR2025-00789 (Patent 11,075,786 B1)
IPR2025-00790 (Patent 11,223,508 B1)
IPR2025-00791 (Patent 11,252,005 B1)
IPR2025-00792 (Patent 11,381,285 B1)
IPR2025-00793 (Patent 11,424,792 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Andrew Sommer
Trenton Ward
Elana Araj
Bryan Hanks J
Jared Lee
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
sommera@gtlaw.com
trenton.ward@gtlaw.com
araje@gtlaw.com
bryan.hanks@gtlaw.com
jared.lee@gtlaw.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Ragnar Olson
GLOBAL IP LAW GROUP, LLC
rolson@giplg.com