Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper: 18
Entered: July 29, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RJ BRANDS, LLC d/b/a CHEFMAN,
Petitioner,

v.

SHARKNINJA OPERATING LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-01529 (Patent 11,389,026 B2)
IPR2025-01530 (Patent 11,672,377 B2)[1]

Before KEN B. BARRETT, HYUN J. JUNG, JAMES A. TARTAL, and FREDERICK C. LANEY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.[2]

JUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

---

[1] This Order addresses issues that are the same in each of these proceedings. We issue one Order to be entered in each proceeding. The parties are not authorized to use this style caption.
[2] This is not an expanded panel decision. A three-judge panel presides over each proceeding.

I. INTRODUCTION

On July 16, 2026, with the Board's authorization, Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively referred to as "the Parties") filed a Joint Motion to Terminate in each of the above-identified proceedings. Paper 16[3] ("Joint Motion"). In support of the Joint Motion in each proceeding, the Parties filed a copy of a Confidential Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release (Ex. 2004, "Settlement Agreement"), as well as a Joint Request to Treat Settlement Agreement as Business Confidential Information (Paper 17, "Joint Request").

II. DISCUSSION

In the Joint Motions, the Parties represent, for each of the above-identified proceedings, that they "have reached agreement . . . to resolve their disputes." Joint Motion 1. The Parties further represent, for each proceeding, that the filed copy of the Settlement Agreement is "a true and correct copy," and "that the Settlement Agreement is the complete agreement made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this inter partes review proceeding." *Id.* at 1–2.

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." Section 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) also provides that if no petitioner remains in the *inter partes* review, the Office may terminate the review.

---

[3] For expediency, we cite to papers in IPR2025-01529. Similar papers were filed in IPR2025-01530.

The Director instituted trials in the above-identified proceedings. Paper 9. We have not yet decided the merits of the proceedings, and final written decisions have not been entered. Notwithstanding that the proceedings have moved beyond the preliminary stage, the Parties have adequately shown that termination of the proceedings is appropriate. Joint Motion 2–3. Under these circumstances, we determine that good cause exists to terminate the proceedings with respect to the Parties.

In the Joint Requests, the Parties request that the Settlement Agreement "be treated as business confidential information," "be maintained separate from the publicly available file of the involved patent[s]," and "be made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to persons showing good cause on written request, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c)." Joint Request 2. After reviewing the Settlement Agreement, we find that it contains confidential business information regarding the terms of settlement. We determine that good cause exists to treat the Settlement Agreement as business confidential information pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

The Parties additionally "request that they be notified if and when the Board receives and/or considers a request for access to the settlement agreement and be offered an opportunity to respond to any such request." Joint Request 2. The Parties present no persuasive argument for requiring the Office to notify the Parties of a request for access or to provide an opportunity to the Parties to respond to any such request. In the absence of any persuasive argument, we decline to issue an order regarding notification and response upon receiving access requests for the Settlement Agreement.

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, based on the Joint Motions and Joint requests it is:

ORDERED that IPR2025-01529 and IPR2025-01530 are *terminated* pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Settlement Agreement (Ex. 2004) shall be kept separate from the files of U.S. Patent Nos. 11,389,026 B2 and 11,672,377 B2, and be made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

FOR PETITIONER:

Bradley D. Liddle
Michael C. Pomeroy
Keith D. Fredlake
Douglas Link
COZEN O'CONNOR
bliddle@cozen.com
mpomeroy@cozen.com
kfredlake@cozen.com
dlink@cozen.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Brian M. Buroker
Nathan Curtis
David Glandorf
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
GDC-SharkNinja-Chefman@gibsondunn.com