

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.,

Petitioners

v.

WHIRLPOOL CORPORATION

Patent Owner

Case IPR2026-00337
Patent 10,512,385

**PATENT OWNER'S
DISCRETIONARY DENIAL BRIEFING PURSUANT
TO THE DIRECTOR'S MARCH 26, 2025 MEMORANDUM**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"

Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
EX2001	Complaint for Patent Infringement, <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 1, filed Oct. 10, 2025 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2002	Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement, <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 38, filed Feb. 9, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2003	Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 4, filed Oct. 10, 2025 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2004	Samsung's Opposition to Whirlpool's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Redacted), <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 24, filed Dec. 15, 2025 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2005	Expert Declaration of Dr. Kimberly K. Cameron Regarding Non-infringement and Invalidity of the Asserted Patents, <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 70-1, filed May 27, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2006	Expert Declaration of Dr. Kimberly K. Cameron Regarding Non-infringement and Invalidity of U.S. Patent No. 12,543,922 (Redacted), <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 70-2, filed May 27, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2007	Expert Declaration of Dr. Kimberly K. Cameron Regarding Non-infringement and Invalidity of the Asserted Patents (Redacted), <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 70-3, filed May 27, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2008	Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing Held April 8, 2026 (Redacted), <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 76, filed June 10, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2009	Plaintiff's Post-hearing Brief in Support of Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 65, filed May 5, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2010	Samsung's Post-hearing Responsive Brief in Opposition to Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (Redacted), <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 70, filed May 27, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2011	Plaintiff's Post-hearing Reply Brief in Support of Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (Redacted), <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung</i>

	<i>Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 75, filed June 10, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)
EX2012	Declaration Of Justin DeLapa In Support Of Patent Owner's Discretionary Denial Briefing Pursuant To The Director's March 26, 2025 Memorandum
EX2013	Docket Report, <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042 (E.D. Tex.) last accessed June 11, 2026
EX2014	Whirlpool Corporation Product Marking Page, available at https://www.patent-listing.com/index.html (last accessed June 10, 2026)
EX2015	Docket Control Order, <i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042, Dkt. No. 78, filed June 12, 2026 (E.D. Tex.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Factual Background	3
A. The Parties are already litigating the validity of the patents.	3
B. The Whirlpool Patents address related subject matter.....	5
III. Argument	5
A. Samsung uses the IPR Proceeding as a second bite at the validity apple.....	6
B. These proceedings will harm U.S. manufacturing.....	10
C. The remaining <i>Fintiv</i> factors support discretionary denial.....	12
1. Factor 1: whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted.....	14
2. Factor 2: proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision.....	15
3. Factor 3: investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties.....	16
4. Factor 4: overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding	17
5. Factor 5: whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party.....	18
6. Factor 6: other circumstances that impact the Board’s exercise of discretion, including the merits.....	18
D. Additional considerations also support discretionary denial.....	20
IV. Conclusion	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. et al. v. Concurrent Ventures, LLC et al.</i> , IPR2025-00223, Paper 9 (Acting Director Stewart June 12, 2025)	16
<i>AGIS Software Development LLC v. Google LLC</i> , No. 2:19-cv-361-JRG, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24195 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 9, 2021)	15
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (PTAB March 20, 2020)	12
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 (PTAB May 13, 2020)	6, 13
<i>Coretronic Corp. v. Maxell, Ltd.</i> , IPR2025-00474, Paper 11 (PTAB Jul. 10, 2025)	15
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016)	6, 12
<i>Force Mos Tech., Co. Ltd. v. Asustek Computer, Inc.</i> , No. 2:22-cv-460-JRG, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66423 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 11, 2024)	15
<i>Gen. Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017)	13
<i>In re Magnum Oil Tools Int’l, Ltd.</i> , 829 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	9
<i>LifeScan Scotland, Ltd. v. Shasta Techs., LLC</i> , 734 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2013)	6
<i>Magnolia Medical Techs., Inc. v. Kurin, Inc.</i> , IPR2026-00097, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B., May 14, 2026)	passim
<i>Natera, Inc. v. NeoGenomics Labs., Inc.</i> , 106 F.4th 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2024)	7, 9
<i>NHK Spring Co. Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs. Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018)	13
<i>Sotera Wireless</i> , IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 (PTAB, December 1, 2020)	18
<i>Tessera Advanced Techs., Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 120999 (E.D. Tex. July 19, 2018)	14
<i>Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-01042 (E.D. Tex.)	1

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314(a)	9, 12
--------------------------	-------

Regulations

37 CFR § 42.51(b)(2).....	19
---------------------------	----

I. Introduction

Patent Owner Whirlpool Corporation (“Whirlpool”) respectfully requests that the Director discretionarily deny Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc.’s (collectively “Samsung”) Petition to institute inter partes review of U.S. Patent No. 10,512,385 (the “’385 Patent”). In support of discretionary denial, Whirlpool submits this briefing—limited in scope to discretionary denial issues—pursuant to the Director’s March 26, 2025 Memorandum.

First, the parallel District Court lawsuit¹ will address the same invalidity grounds raised in this IPR. Whirlpool sued Samsung for infringement of the ’385 Patent (as well as U.S. Patent No. 12,232,681 (the “’681 Patent”)) in the Eastern District of Texas on October 10, 2025. Concurrently with the complaint, Whirlpool filed a motion for a preliminary injunction, seeking to enjoin Samsung from selling its infringing dishwashers in direct competition with Whirlpool’s premium dishwasher line. The parties have since filed extensive briefing on the preliminary injunction issues, including addressing validity of the ’385 Patent. The invalidity grounds raised by Samsung in the preliminary injunction rely on the Boach, Ochoa, and Schessl references – the same challenge presented in this Petition. Both

¹ *Whirlpool Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al.*, No. 2:25-cv-01042 (E.D. Tex.) (the “District Court lawsuit”).

Samsung and Whirlpool have submitted multiple rounds of expert declarations in support of their validity positions. Samsung is relying on the same expert, Dr. Cameron, used in its IPR. The District Court also held a day-long evidentiary hearing that led to another round of briefing on the preliminary injunction issues, including validity.

The District Court has heavily invested in this case as part of the preliminary injunction proceedings and will determine whether Samsung has “rais[ed] a substantial question concerning . . . validity” of the ’385 Patent over the same art is at issue in this Petition. The District Court will issue a preliminary opinion touching on validity arguments that substantially overlap with the IPR institution decision: whether Samsung has shown a reasonable likelihood of invalidity of at least one claim. Discretionary denial, therefore, is warranted because this proceeding will concurrently address essentially the same validity issues raised in the District Court lawsuit, rather than presenting a less expensive alternative forum for deciding validity. Further, the District Court likely will make a preliminary ruling on these validity issues before any merits-based decision by the Board. The trial in the District Court proceeding will occur a few months after the final written decision in the IPR.

Discretionary denial also is warranted because Samsung uses this IPR proceeding to mount duplicative invalidity attacks against Whirlpool, who is a U.S. manufacturer of patented dishwashers. Whirlpool has a century-long tradition of

manufacturing its products in the United States and relying on American suppliers.

Whirlpool employs more than 14,000 manufacturing employees making products at 10 manufacturing facilities across the United States, with an 11th facility on the way.

In fact, the premium dishwashers that practice the '385 Patent are manufactured in Findlay, Ohio, the largest dishwasher factory in the USA. Samsung, conversely, is a Korea-based company and, to the best of Whirlpool's knowledge, does not manufacture any dishwashers in the United States.

In addition to these considerations, the remaining *Fintiv* factors favor discretionary denial: (i) the District Court is very unlikely to grant a stay in the lawsuit, especially in light of the preliminary injunction issues currently pending before the Court; (ii) the District Court's decision on the preliminary injunction will precede any Final Written Decision; (iii) the parties and the court have already heavily invested in the District Court lawsuit; (iv) there is complete overlap in the issues; and (v) the parties are the same.

II. Factual Background

A. The Parties are already litigating the validity of the patents.

Whirlpool is the owner of the '385 and '681 Patents and manufactures dishwashers in the United States that implement the patented inventions. EX2014. Whirlpool sued Samsung for infringement of those patents in the Eastern District of Texas on October 10, 2025. *See generally* EX2001. That same day, Whirlpool filed

its motion for a preliminary injunction, seeking to enjoin Samsung from infringing the '681 and '385 Patents by copying Whirlpool's unique dishwasher design that it has rolled out in its premium KitchenAid dishwasher lines. *See generally* EX2003. Samsung filed its response on December 15, 2025. *See generally* EX2004. On February 9, 2026, Whirlpool amended its complaint to also assert infringement of U.S. Patent No. 12,543,922 (the "'922 Patent") (collectively with the '385 and '681 Patents, the "Whirlpool Patents"), and the '922 Patent was added to the preliminary injunction proceeding. *See generally* EX2002. Since the filing of the preliminary injunction motion, the parties have submitted seven separate expert declarations in total, including three declarations by Dr. Kimberly Cameron, Samsung's expert, addressing invalidity of the '385, '681, and/or '922 Patents. *See generally* EX2005-EX2007.

In her declarations, Dr. Cameron asserts virtually identical obviousness grounds as those presented in Samsung's IPR Petitions. *See* EX2005 §§ VIII.A.1, VIII.A.2; EX2007 § V.A. In fact, Dr. Cameron's analysis is essentially the same, relying on similar citations, figures, and reasoning in both the declarations filed in the District Court and before the Board and adapting that analysis in this proceeding to apply additionally to independent claim 13.

The District Court held an evidentiary hearing on April 8, 2026. At that hearing, the Court heard extensive arguments from the parties related to validity,

including significant discussion of Dr. Cameron’s analysis. *See, e.g.*, EX2008 at 213:15-19. Following the hearing, the parties submitted additional post-hearing briefing consistent with the Court’s Order. *See generally* EX2009-EX2011.

A few days after the evidentiary hearing, and more than six months after the complaint in the District Court lawsuit was filed, Samsung filed the first of its petitions. *See* Paper 1. This table shows the accorded filing dates and projected final written decision deadline for each proceeding:

Patent No.	IPR No.	Accorded Filing Date	Projected Final Written Decision
12,232,681	IPR2026-00336	April 13, 2026	October 13, 2027
10,512,385	IPR2026-00337	April 15, 2026	October 15, 2027
12,543,922	PGR2026-00043	April 14, 2026	October 14, 2027

B. The Whirlpool Patents address related subject matter.

Each of the Whirlpool Patents relates to Whirlpool’s “hero” dishwasher feature—its premium third rack. EX2008 at 9:19-22, 25:2-15. This new patented design holds utensils in a horizontal orientation while simultaneously featuring cup seats that cradle drinkware, preventing unwanted movement in the rack to minimize breakage. It also includes a sprayer with multiple nozzles strategically placed to inject water into the interior of the cradled drinkware to enhance cleaning.

III. Argument

“Congress afforded significant discretion to the Director in duly executing the purposes of the AIA” including “to ensure fairness, efficiency, and predictability.”

Magnolia Medical Techs., Inc. v. Kurin, Inc., IPR2026-00097, Paper 17 at 6-7 (P.T.A.B., May 14, 2026) (precedential); *see also Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, 136 S. Ct. 2131, 2140 (2016). Accordingly, the Director has discretion to deny institution in the public interest and “based on the totality of the evidence and arguments presented” by the parties. *Id.* at 2, 7-8. In that vein, the *Fintiv* case “sets forth factors that balance considerations of system efficiency, fairness, and patent quality when a patent owner raises an argument for discretionary denial due to the advanced state of a parallel proceeding.” *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 at 7–8 (PTAB May 13, 2020) (informative).

In *Magnolia*, the Director recognized additional instances in addition to those outlined in *Fintiv* where AIA review does not serve the public interests. One is when AIA reviews are not used as a true alternative to litigation, but instead as a “second bite at the apple” for a patent challenger. *See Magnolia* at 3-4, 9. The second, is when reviews are used to disadvantage U.S. manufacturing. *Id.* at 4-6. Samsung’s Petition implicates both issues.

A. Samsung uses the IPR Proceeding as a second bite at the validity apple.

As part of the preliminary injunction proceedings, the District Court has already invested significant resources in determining whether Samsung’s obviousness arguments “rais[e] a substantial question concerning . . . validity.”

LifeScan Scotland, Ltd. v. Shasta Techs., LLC, 734 F.3d 1361, 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2013);

see also EX2004 at 11. Now, four months after serving its initial invalidity declaration in the District Court litigation, Samsung asks the PTAB to institute a parallel IPR based on essentially the same primary art and arguments advanced in the District Court. *See generally* EX2004. Institution of Samsung’s IPR Petition by the Board will cause “the parties to spend more time and resources litigating patent validity than they would have in the absence of AIA review,” *see Magnolia* at 3, and raises the possibility of inconsistent results between the Board and the District Court.

The Federal Circuit applies a four-factor test to determine whether a preliminary injunction should be granted. *Natera, Inc. v. NeoGenomics Labs., Inc.*, 106 F.4th 1369, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2024). The first issue is whether the patent owner has established a likelihood of success on the merits. *Id.* This requires that the patent owner show it is likely to prove infringement and withstand any validity challenges. *Id.* A determination of this critical factor requires the District Court to analyze claim construction, infringement allegations, and any invalidity positions advanced by the defendant. *See id.* at 1375–77. Unlike at trial in a patent case, the preliminary injunction proceeding shifts the burden on validity to the patent owner to show that the patent is likely valid and the challenges lack substantial merit. *Id.* at 1376–77. Such proceedings require significant up-front investment by the District Court, far beyond what is necessary at the outset of a typical patent case.

As a result, the District Court has received comprehensive briefing and heard

extensive argument from the parties on the infringement and validity issues related to the '385 Patent. *Supra* Section II.A. To date, the parties have filed five briefs, with a sixth due June 17, 2026, comprising 123 pages of briefing and attaching 77 additional documents including 7 expert declarations. *See* EX2013; EX2003, EX2004, EX2009–EX2011. At the all-day evidentiary hearing, the Court heard argument from both parties on validity and infringement and received testimony related to copying and irreparable harm from Whirlpool's witness, Michelle Villarroel, and Samsung's witness, Josh Stumacher.² EX2008 at 4:8-13.

These briefs and arguments currently before the District Court raise remarkably similar issues to those presented in this IPR proceeding, namely, whether Samsung has raised a substantial question concerning obviousness of the '385 Patent's claims relative to Bosch, Ochoa, and Schessl. *See* EX2004 at 13-14. Within days of this submission, the District Court will receive the last of the requested supplemental briefs and will weigh the evidence to make its decision on infringement and validity based on the extensive record and arguments presented. In

² The Court expected to hear testimony by both parties' experts who both traveled to Marshall, Texas, but Dr. Cameron was unavailable due to illness. EX2008 3:24-4:7. Instead of live testimony, the parties agreed that declarations would be submitted to the District Court, supplemented by additional briefing.

light of the expedited nature of preliminary injunctions, the District Court has and will invest significant resources in this case before the Board analyzes the merits of Samsung's Petition. Moreover, the parallel proceedings at the District Court and the Board, if it were to institute, would raise the possibility of inconsistent findings on essentially the same issues.

After completing its review of the record, the District Court should resolve nearly the same question as the Board will at institution: whether Samsung has "rais[ed] a substantial question concerning" obviousness of the '385 Patent based on Bosch in view of Ochoa and Schessl. As the Federal Circuit has explained, this analysis will include resolving "whether the patentee has shown it is more likely than not to prevail over an invalidity challenge." *Natera, Inc. v. NeoGenomics Labs., Inc.*, 106 F.4th 1369, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2024). Before the Board, the burdens are swapped, but the underlying question is effectively the same: whether Samsung has shown a reasonable likelihood that at least one claim of the '385 Patent would have been obvious. 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) (an IPR may not be instituted unless the petition "shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition"). In either case, the patent challenger cannot merely rely on conclusory argument and must explain its reasoning. *Natera*, 106 F.4th at 1377; *In re Magnum Oil Tools Int'l, Ltd.*, 829 F.3d 1364, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2016). Unsurprisingly, Samsung makes largely identical

arguments in both forums.

This case is a prime example of a petitioner seeking to obtain a second bite at the invalidity apple. This tactic, combined with the District Court's significant investment in the lawsuit, justifies discretionary denial of Samsung's petition. Moreover, as explained below, additional factors warrant discretionary denial.

B. These proceedings will harm U.S. manufacturing.

The Director has acknowledged that duplicative IPR proceedings may be used to disadvantage American patent holders and manufacturers. *Magnolia* at 4-5. This Petition was filed by a foreign manufacturer that seeks to incorporate a design patented by an American manufacturer, and who then uses an *Inter Partes* Review proceeding to give itself two opportunities to render invalid a commercially valuable patent. *See* EX2014. This IPR proceeding thus serves only to provide a tactical advantage to a company that does not make its infringing dishwashers in the United States.

In contrast, Whirlpool has long been committed to designing and manufacturing products in the United States. EX2012 ¶¶2-4. Since its founding nearly 125 years ago, Whirlpool has based its headquarters in the small town of Benton Harbor, Michigan. *Id.* ¶¶2-3. In the many years since its founding, Whirlpool has expanded to 11 manufacturing sites in the United States where it employs 14,000 Americans. *Id.* ¶4. Last year, Whirlpool made more than 13,000,000 products in the

United States under its Whirlpool brand, and other associated brands, including KitchenAid, JennAir, Maytag, and Amana. *Id.* These products span the home appliance market and include refrigerators, washers, dryers, and dishwashers, including the dishwashers covered by the '385 Patent. *Id.*

Whirlpool has long made significant investments in American technology and manufacturing. Whirlpool currently employs 600 research and development staff at various locations in the United States, including at its headquarters in Benton Harbor. *Id.* ¶5. These engineers have contributed to over 10,000 U.S. Patents over the past 125 years that have led to important technical innovations, ranging from more efficient and better washing machines to experimental kitchens developed for NASA. *Id.* This investment in American innovation is the keystone to Whirlpool's continued manufacturing here in the United States. *Id.*

The dishwashers covered by the '385 Patent are produced at Whirlpool's facility in Findlay, Ohio. *Id.* ¶6-7. The Findlay factory employs 2,000 American citizens producing up to 13,000 dishwashers per day. *Id.* ¶6. It is the largest dishwasher factory in the United States and one of the largest in the world. *Id.* The majority of the subparts and components used in these dishwashers are from the United States. *Id.* Of the over 1,200 parts used in these dishwashers, over 850 are made in the U.S. by Whirlpool and 90 different American suppliers. *Id.*

Samsung and Whirlpool are competitors, particularly in the kitchen appliance

market. *Id.* ¶8. Unlike Whirlpool, Samsung is Korea-based and does not produce the infringing dishwashers in the United States. *Id.* Instead, these dishwashers are manufactured abroad and shipped to the United States. *Id.*

As the Director has recognized, using IPR and PGR proceedings as a duplicative attack by a foreign entity against an American manufacturer’s commercially valuable patent fails to serve the public interest, and instead “provide[s] a tactical advantage to companies that neither manufacture in the United States nor make American manufacturing investments.” *Magnolia* at 7. Accordingly, institution should be discretionarily denied for this additional reason.

C. The remaining *Fintiv* factors support discretionary denial.

In addition to the above unique considerations, the remaining *Fintiv* factors “support the exercise of authority to deny institution” based on parallel district court litigation. *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11, at 6 (PTAB March 20, 2020) (precedential) (“*Fintiv*”). The Director has discretion to deny institution under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). *Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, 136 S. Ct. 2131, 2140 (2016). The USPTO should exercise such discretion here and deny the Petition because nearly identical invalidity arguments currently are being addressed in the District Court lawsuit, and the Board has not begun to analyze the merits of Samsung’s Petition. Additionally, the District Court will likely resolve the same or similar invalidity issues, at least on a preliminary basis, prior to any final written

decision by the Board. Accordingly, any Board review of Samsung’s petition would not be an efficient use of the Board’s resources and raises the potential for inconsistent findings on the same or very similar obviousness issues.

The USPTO considers the presence and status of parallel district court litigation in determining whether to deny institution. *See NHK Spring Co. Ltd. v. Intri-Plex Techs. Inc.*, IPR2018-00752, Paper 8 at 20 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018) (precedential); *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 15 at 17 (PTAB May 13, 2020) (informative) [hereinafter “*Fintiv*”]; *see also Gen. Plastic Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha*, IPR2016-01357, Paper 19 at 16–17 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017) (“[W]e recognize that an objective of the AIA is to provide an effective and efficient alternative to district court litigation . . .”). *Fintiv* “sets forth factors that balance considerations of system efficiency, fairness, and patent quality when a patent owner raises an argument for discretionary denial due to the advanced state of a parallel proceeding.” *Fintiv*, Paper 15 at 7–8. The factors are:

1. whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted;
2. proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision;
3. investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties;
4. overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding;

5. whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party; and
6. other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion, including the merits.

Id. “[T]he Board examines these factors, which relate to whether efficiency, fairness, and the merits support the exercise of authority to deny institution. In evaluating the factors, the Board takes a holistic view of whether efficiency and integrity of the system are best served by denying or instituting review.” *Id.* (internal citations omitted). As detailed below, these factors favor discretionary denial.

1. Factor 1: whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted

This factor favors discretionary denial because Samsung has not filed a motion to stay, and even if it did, that motion will almost certainly be denied. The “universal practice” in the Eastern District of Texas is to “den[y] stay requests when the PTAB has not yet acted on the petition for review.” *Tessera Advanced Techs., Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 120999, *10-11 (E.D. Tex. July 19, 2018). Thus, until the Director makes his institution decisions in each IPR proceeding, any stay motion Samsung files will almost certainly be denied.

But even if the Director decides to institute IPR on some of the Whirlpool Patents, the Eastern District of Texas is unlikely to stay litigation. That is because “[i]t has been [that district’s] consistent and long-established practice to deny

motions to stay pending IPR . . . when the PTAB . . . [has] instituted review on less than all asserted claims of all asserted patents.” *AGIS Software Development LLC v. Google LLC*, No. 2:19-cv-361-JRG, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24195, at *9 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 9, 2021); *see Force Mos Tech., Co. Ltd. v. Asustek Computer, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-460-JRG, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 66423, at *10 (E.D. Tex. Apr. 11, 2024). Thus, pursuant to established precedent from that Court, to have any chance of receiving a stay, all three of Samsung’s Petitions would need to be instituted.

In sum, there is strong evidence that any theoretical stay motion will be denied, which favors discretionary denial. At minimum, “there is insufficient evidence that the district court is likely to stay its proceeding even if the Board were to institute trial.” *Coretronic Corp. v. Maxell, Ltd.*, IPR2025-00474, Paper 11 at 2 (PTAB Jul. 10, 2025) (Stewart, C.M.).

2. Factor 2: proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision

This factor is neutral. The anticipated deadline for the Board’s final written decision, should this case be instituted, would be October 15, 2027, slightly sooner (by just under two months) than trial in the District Court lawsuit, which is scheduled for December 6, 2027. EX2015 at 1.

Although slightly later, the District Court trial date and the projected final written decision deadline are close in time. *See, e.g., Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. et al. v. Concurrent Ventures, LLC et al.*, IPR2025-00223, Paper 9 at 2 (Acting

Director Stewart June 12, 2025) (discretionarily denying based—in part—on the final written decision deadline and scheduled trial date being within approximately two weeks of each other) (reversed on rehearing due to subsequent stay in district court proceeding). “Even though a district court trial date that occurs after a projected final written decision date reduces the possibility of conflicting decisions, that benefit does not outweigh the efficiencies gained by avoiding parallel proceedings in this instance because of the parties’ meaningful investment in the district court proceeding...” *Id.*

Given the substantial investment in the District Court lawsuit that will occur before any final written decision might issue in this proceeding, this factor is neutral, at worse. But if the preliminary injunction proceedings are considered, including the extensive briefing and the full day hearing on Whirlpool’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction that has already occurred, then this factor favors discretionary denial because that decision will likely pre-date even the Institution Decision.

3. Factor 3: investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties

This factor weighs heavily in favor of discretionary denial because of the significant investment the District Court and the parties have made already. *See supra* Section III.A. In the District Court lawsuit, the parties have been litigating Whirlpool’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction for more than eight months and the District Court has invested and will continue to invest considerable time and

resources in this case. *Supra* Section III.A, III.C.2. In that time, both parties conducted discovery, invested significant resources in lawyers and experts, prepared witnesses, and traveled with those witnesses, attorneys, experts, and in-house counsel to the preliminary injunction hearing. *See, e.g.*, EX2008 at 3:8-23, EX2015.

Beyond the preliminary injunction, trial in the District Court is scheduled to start on December 6, 2027, less than two months after the projected final written decision deadlines in the proceedings for the Whirlpool Patents. EX2015; *see supra* Section II.A. By that time, the Preliminary Injunction motion will be resolved, and the parties and the Court will be preparing for trial. The District Court will have held a *Markman* hearing, and the parties will have concluded fact and expert discovery, filed dispositive motions, and served pretrial disclosures, all before the Board's decision. EX2015. Given the significant investment in the parallel District Court lawsuit, this factor strongly favors denial.

4. Factor 4: overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding

Factor 4 strongly favors discretionary denial given the complete overlap between the invalidity allegations in the District Court lawsuit and the Petition. *See Supra* Section III.A. As noted above, Samsung asserts nearly the same obviousness Grounds in this IPR as it is asserting in its opposition to Whirlpool's motion for a preliminary injunction in the District Court lawsuit.

Despite this overlap, or perhaps because of it, Petitioner offered no stipulation

(*Sotera* or otherwise) to attempt to mitigate the duplication of effort that would occur if this IPR was instituted. The absence of any stipulation confirms that Samsung views this proceeding as an additional “bite at the apple” rather than any sort of true alternative to trying validity in the District Court lawsuit. *See Magnolia* at 3-4, 9-10. In fact, Samsung likely cannot make such a stipulation given the invalidity positions it has already advanced in its opposition to the Preliminary Injunction motion, involving the same art as Samsung’s Petition. This factor favors discretionary denial.

5. Factor 5: whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party

Petitioner Samsung and Patent Owner Whirlpool are parties to both the lawsuit and this IPR, *see* EX2001 at 1, which favors discretionary denial. *Sotera Wireless*, IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 at 19.

6. Factor 6: other circumstances that impact the Board’s exercise of discretion, including the merits

Factor 6 weighs in favor of discretionary denial. Both the District Court’s investment in Whirlpool’s motion for preliminary injunction and Whirlpool’s U.S. manufacturing support discretionary denial. *See supra* Sections III.A, III.B. In addition, the District Court is better situated to resolve this obviousness challenge by Samsung because of the fulsome discovery available to the Parties in that forum. For example, the District Court heard live testimony during the preliminary injunction hearing related to Samsung’s copying of the patented dishwasher features,

which in addition to addressing the infringement issue, also is highly relevant to the secondary indicia of non-obviousness. *See, e.g.*, EX2008 at 7:7-13, 50:9-15, 78:9-14. Other evidence related to copying (and other secondary considerations) is in Samsung's possession and will require extensive discovery measures to obtain given its confidential nature. *See, e.g., id.* at 24:8-22 (redacting information). Whirlpool can pursue this evidence in the District Court proceeding, but the limited nature of an IPR proceeding will restrict Whirlpool's ability to obtain that evidence here and unduly prejudice Whirlpool. *See, e.g.*, 37 CFR § 42.51(b)(2) (permitting additional discovery only when it is in "the interests of justice").

Yet another factor favoring discretionary denial is that the merits of the Petition are relatively weak as to the '385 Patent's claims 13 and 17, the only challenged independent claims.

For example, claim elements 13[c(ii)] and 17[d(ii)] both recite a "curved mounting portion." Samsung contends that this element is taught by a hypothetical "Bosch-Ochoa combined Figure 3'." This figure is entirely fabricated by Samsung and does not exist in either reference. Instead, Samsung created it out of whole cloth by combining what it believes Bosch's Figure 3 illustrates. But not only is this figure entirely hypothetical, it also improperly adds a "curved mounting portion" not taught by either reference. This modification is nothing but improper hindsight, premised on the idea that a POSITA would make this change because it would "provide

additional support.” Pet. at 16.

This is only one example of the deficiencies present in the IPR Petition, but it serves to illustrate that this is not a situation where the Petitioner has clearly established a significant obviousness concern.

D. Additional considerations also support discretionary denial.

In addition to the *Fintiv* factor analysis and other considerations discussed above, Samsung’s Petition relies heavily on its expert declaration in an attempt to satisfy limitations absent from its cited art. In the absence of compelling prior art, Samsung has cited its expert approximately 92 times in its Petition. *See generally* Pet. (citing “Ex-1002”). Yet its expert added little (if any) value to its analysis, frequently providing conclusory statements and parroting the contents of the Petition. *See* EX1002. It is plain that the declarations upon which it relies are more accurately framed as attorney argument and Samsung’s heavy reliance on conclusory testimony that simply duplicates arguments made in the Petition is not helpful to the trier of fact and provides yet another reason the Petition should be discretionarily denied.

IV. Conclusion

Whirlpool respectfully requests that the Director discretionarily deny institution of *inter partes* review for the reasons stated herein.

Dated: June 16, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael F. Heim /

Michael F. Heim (Reg. No. 32,702)

Attorney for Patent Owner

Whirlpool Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), a true copy of the foregoing DISCRETIONARY DENIAL BRIEF was served on the date below to the following lead counsel for Petitioners via e-mail:

Lead Counsel for Petitioners	Back-up Counsel for Petitioners
Benjamin M. Haber (Reg. No. 67,129) O'Melveny & Myers LLP 400 South Hope Street, 19th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 Telephone: (213) 430-6000 Fax: (213) 430-6407 Email: bhaber@omm.com	William M. Fink (Reg. No. 72,332) Argirenia Zervos (<i>PHV</i> anticipated) Jacob Boesch (Reg. No. 83,637) O'Melveny & Myers LLP 1625 Eye Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20006 Telephone: (202) 383-5300 Fax: (202) 383-5414 Email: tfink@omm.com Email: rzervos@omm.com Email: jboesch@omm.com Frances Mackay (<i>PHV</i> anticipated) O'Melveny & Myers LLP 2801 North Harwood Street, Suite 1600 Dallas, TX 75201-2692 Telephone: (972) 360-1900 Fax: (972) 360-1901 Email: fmackay@omm.com

Dated: June 16, 2026

By: /s/ Michael F. Heim
Michael F. Heim (Reg. No. 32,702)
Attorney for Patent Owner
Whirlpool Corporation