UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
_____

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
_____

INTEL CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

ZOND, LLC,
Patent Owner.

_____

Cases IPR2014-00843
IPR2014-00923
IPR2014-00945
Patent 6,806,652 B2[1]

_____

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, DEBRA K. STEPHENS, JONI Y. CHANG,
SUSAN L.C. MITCHELL, and JENNIFER M. MEYER,
Administrative Patent Judges.

CHANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

JUDGMENT
Termination of Proceeding before Institution
37 C.F.R. § 42.73

---

[1] This Decision addresses the same issue in the above-identified cases.
Therefore, we issue one Decision to be entered in all cases. The parties may
not use this style of filing in subsequent papers, without prior authorization.

On September 12, 2014, Petitioner, Intel Corporation ("Intel"), and
Patent Owner, Zond, LLC ("Zond"), filed a Joint Motion to Terminate in
each of the above-identified proceedings, involving of U.S. Patent
No. 6,806,652 ("the '652 patent"). Paper 7.[2] The parties also filed a true
copy of their Written Settlement Agreement, made in connection with the
termination of the proceedings, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and
37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b). Ex. 1115.[3] Additionally, the parties submitted a Joint
Request to have their Written Settlement Agreement treated as confidential
business information under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c).
Paper 7, 9. For the reasons set forth below, the Joint Motions to Terminate
and the Joint Request are *granted*.

In their Joint Motions to Terminate, the parties indicate that they have
settled all of their disputes involving the following patents: U.S. Patent Nos.
6,805,779 B2, 6,806,652 B1, 6,853,142 B2, 7,147,759 B2, 7,604,716 B2,
7,808,184 B2, and 7,811,421 B2. *Id*. at 1. In particular, the parties have
agreed to settle and dismiss their related district court litigation, *Zond, LLC
v. Intel Corp.*, No.1:13-cv-11570-RGS (D. Mass.). *Id*. More importantly,
the parties also have submitted Motions to Terminate all other *inter partes*
reviews requested by Intel for the aforementioned patents. The proceedings,
involving those patents, are listed in the Appendix of this Decision.

---

[2] For the purpose of clarity and expediency, we treat IPR2014-00843 as
representative, and all citations are to IPR2014-00843 unless otherwise
noted.

[3] As authorized by the Board's previous Order, the parties filed one copy of
their Written Settlement Agreement in IPR2014-00843 for all the above-
identified proceedings.

Intel filed a Petition and, in response, Zond filed a Preliminary Response in each of the above-identified proceedings. However, we have not determined yet the merits of the proceedings—specifically, whether an *inter partes* review of the '652 patent should be instituted.

Zond urges the Board to terminate the above-identified proceedings with respect to both parties, because concluding the proceedings, at this early stage, would promote efficiency and reduce cost, consistent with the legislative intent. Paper 7, 5–8 (citing 154 Cong. Rec. S9987 (daily ed. Sept. 27, 2008) (statement of Sen. Kyl); 157 Cong. Rec. S1376 (daily ed. Mar. 8, 2001) (statement of Sen. Kyl)). Zond contends that terminating the proceedings upon settlement would "establish a more efficient and streamlined patent system that, *inter alia*, limits unnecessary and counterproductive litigation cost," and "foster[] an environment that promotes settlements, thereby creating a timely, cost-effective alternative to litigation." *Id*. at 5–6.

Generally, the Board expects that a proceeding will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement. *See, e.g.,* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,768 (Aug. 14, 2012). As no trial has been instituted based on Intel's Petitions involving the '652 patent, each of the proceedings is in the preliminary proceeding stage.[4] Upon consideration of the facts before us, we determine that it is appropriate to terminate the above-identified proceedings as to both parties, and enter judgment.

---

[4] A preliminary proceeding begins with the filing of a petition for instituting a trial and ends with a written decision as to whether a trial will be instituted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.2.

For the foregoing reasons, it is:

ORDERED that the Joint Motions to Terminate the above-identified *inter partes* reviews are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that the above-identified proceedings are *terminated* as to all parties—namely, Intel and Zond; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' Joint Request that their Written Settlement Agreement be treated as business confidential information 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. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c), is *granted*.

IPR2014-00843, IPR2014-00923, IPR2014-00945
Patent 6,806,652 B2

For PETITIONER:

Richard Goldenberg
Richard.Goldenberg@wilmerhale.com

David L. Cavanaugh
David.Cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Gregory J. Gonsalves
gonsalves@gonsalveslawfirm.com

Bruce J. Barker
bbarker@chsblaw.com

DOCKET ALARM

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.

fastcase
Smarter legal research.