

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

NETLIST, INC.,
Patent Owner.

PGR2025-00071
Patent 12,308,087 B2

Before GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, JON M. JURGOVAN, and
KARA L. SZPONDOWSKI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

JURGOVAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively “the Parties”) filed a Joint Motion to Terminate due to settlement. Paper 38 (“Joint Motion”). In support of the Joint Motion, the Parties filed confidential settlement agreement and collateral agreements (Ex. 1134 (“Settlement Agreements”)), as well as a Joint Request to Treat the Settlement Agreements as Business Confidential Information and to Keep the Settlement Agreements Separate Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c) (Paper 39 (“Joint Request”)) pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 327(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74. Under 35 U.S.C. § 327(a), “[a] post-grant 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.”

In the Joint Motion, the Parties represent that they have reached an agreement to jointly seek termination of this post-grant review. Joint Motion 1. The Parties further represent that the filed copies of the Settlement Agreements are true copies of their settlement agreement and collateral agreements. *Id.* at 2–3. The Parties further represent that “there are no other agreements (other than those filed with the Board), oral or written, between the parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of the proceeding.” *Id.* at 3.

We have not yet decided the merits of this proceeding, and a final written decision has not been entered in this case. Notwithstanding that trial has been instituted and this proceeding has moved beyond the preliminary stage, the Parties have shown adequately that the termination of this proceeding is appropriate. Under these circumstances, we determine that good cause exists to terminate this proceeding.

After reviewing the Settlement Agreements between Petitioner and Patent Owner, we find that the Settlement Agreements contain confidential business information regarding the terms of settlement. We determine that good cause exists to treat the Settlement Agreements between Petitioner and Patent Owner as business confidential information pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 327(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).

This Order does not constitute a final written decision pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 328(a).

ORDER

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is:

ORDERED that the Joint Motion to Terminate (Paper 38) is *granted*, and PGR2025-00071 is hereby *terminated* pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 327(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.72; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Joint Request (Paper 39) to Treat the Settlement Agreements (Exhibit 1134) as Business Confidential Information is *granted*, and the Settlement Agreements shall be kept separate from the files of the challenged patent, 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).

PGR2025-00071
Patent 12,308,087 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Eliot D. Williams
Theodore W. Chandler
Ferenc Pazmandi
Mark A. Speegle
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com
ted.chandler@bakerbotts.com
ferenc.pazmandi@bakerbotts.com
mark.speegle@bakerbotts.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Richard M. Bemben
Jennifer Meyer Chagnon
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
rbemben-ptab@sternekessler.com
jchagnon-ptab@sternekessler.com

Raymond K. Chan
NETLIST, INC.
rchan@netlist.com