

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SIMPSON STRONG-TIE COMPANY INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

COLUMBIA INSURANCE COMPANY,
Patent Owner.

PGR2024-00050
Patent 11,920,339 B2

Before JEFFREY N. FREDMAN, NEIL T. POWELL, and
STEPHEN E. BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FREDMAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

TERMINATION
Due to Settlement After Institution of Trial
35 U.S.C. § 327; 37 C.F.R. § 42.74

On December 1, 2025, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 327 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74, the parties filed a Joint Motion to terminate the instant proceeding. Paper 67. Accompanying the Motion, the parties filed a true copy of a settlement agreement along with a Joint Request to treat the settlement agreement as business confidential, to be kept separate from the patent file under 35 U.S.C. § 327(b) and

37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). Paper 68. We authorized the filing of these papers in a Board email dated November 24, 2025.

We entered a Decision to Institute a post-grant review on February 26, 2025. Paper 11. We also provided guidance on a preliminary amendment. Paper 52. At this juncture of the proceeding, the Board has not entered a final written decision.

The Joint Motion to terminate this proceeding indicates that on November 25, 2025, the parties entered into a confidential settlement agreement. Paper 67. The Joint Motion to terminate explains that “[t]he parties represent that their entire agreement in connection with termination of this proceeding is embodied in the Settlement Agreement, which has been made in writing. There are no collateral agreements or understandings made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this post-grant review.” *Id.* at 3–4. The Board generally expects that a case “will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement, unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding.” Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (“Consolidated Practice Guide”)¹ at 86 (Nov. 2019); *see* 84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019); 37 C.F.R. § 42.72. Based on the facts of this case, it is appropriate to terminate the proceeding. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 317(a); 37 C.F.R. § 42.72. This Order does not constitute a final written decision pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 328(a).

We also determine that the parties have complied with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c) to have the Settlement Agreement treated as business

¹ Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

confidential information and kept separate from the files of the patents at issue in this proceeding. Thus, the Joint Motion to terminate the proceeding and Joint Request that the settlement agreement be treated as business confidential information are granted.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the parties' Joint Request in PGR2024-00050 that the settlement agreement be treated as business confidential information, to be kept separate from the patent file, and made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 327(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c) is *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Motion in PGR2024-00050 to terminate this proceeding is *granted*, and this proceeding is terminated with respect to Petitioner and Patent Owner.

PGR2024-00050

Patents 11,920,339 B2

PETITIONER:

Michelle Holoubek

David Haars

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

holoubek-ptab@sternekessler.com

dhaars-ptab@sternekessler.com

PATENT OWNER:

Kurt James

John Schroeder

Bradley Eidson

Steven Levitt

STINSON LLP

kurt.james@stinson.com

john.schroeder@stinson.com

scott.eidson@stinson.com

steven.levitt@stinson.com