

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AT&T MOBILITY LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

SOLOCRON MEDIA, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00342¹
Patent 6,496,692 B1

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, JACQUELINE W. BONILLA, and
PATRICK M. BOUCHER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BOUCHER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

JUDGMENT
Termination of Proceeding
35 U.S.C. § 317

¹ This order addresses the same issue in the *inter partes* reviews listed in the Appendix. Therefore, we issue one order to be filed in all of the cases. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this style of filing in subsequent papers, without prior authorization.

On May 14, 2015, we terminated each of the proceedings identified in the Appendix (“these proceedings”) with respect to Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, one of two parties previously designated as a Petitioner. Paper 17. On May 20, 2015, the parties moved for termination of these proceedings pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317² with respect to all parties, representing that the only remaining Petitioner, AT&T Mobility LLC, and Patent Owner “have settled their dispute, including reaching agreement to terminate [these] *inter partes* review[s] with respect to AT&T.” Paper 18.

With their motion to terminate, the parties filed a copy of a joint stipulated motion to dismiss the related district-court matter with prejudice to Petitioner. Ex. 1040. The parties also filed a copy of what they represent is a “true and correct copy” of their written agreement in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 317(b). Ex. 1041. The parties request that the agreement be treated as business confidential information under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b).³ Paper 19.

Each of these proceedings is in an early stage and no decision whether to institute *inter partes* reviews has been made. Under these circumstances, we determine that it is appropriate to terminate these proceedings. The outstanding order of May 5, 2015 (Paper 11) accordingly is moot.

It is

ORDERED that the Board’s order of May 5, 2015 (Paper 11) is *vacated*;

² The statute specifically addresses settlement after institution of an *inter partes* review. Similar considerations apply when parties settle before a decision on institution.

³ The motion’s caption refers correctly to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b), but the body of the motion refers incorrectly to 35 U.S.C. § 327(b). The error is harmless.

IPR2015-00342
Patent 6,496,692 B1

FURTHER ORDERED that the joint motions to terminate the proceedings identified in the Appendix are *granted* with respect to all parties; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the joint requests that the settlement agreement be treated as business confidential information and be kept separate from the file of the involved patents under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 317(b), i.e. to be made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause, are *granted*.

IPR2015-00342
Patent 6,496,692 B1

FOR PETITIONER:

Kevin Anderson
kanderson@wileyrein.com

Floyd Chapman
fchapman@wileyrein.com

Scott Felder
sfelder@wileyrein.com

Theodore Stevenson, III
tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com

Scott Hejny
shejny@mckoolsmith.com

Nicholas Matthews
nmathews@mckoolsmith.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Kenneth Weatherwax
weatherwax@lowensteinweatherwax.com

Patrick Maloney
maloney@lowensteinweatherwax.com

IPR2015-00342
Patent 6,496,692 B1

APPENDIX

U.S. Patent No.	<i>Inter Partes</i> Review
6,496,692 B1	IPR2015-00342
7,319,866 B2	IPR2015-00349 IPR2015-00376
7,257,395 B2	IPR2015-00350 IPR2015-00391 IPR2015-00392
7,295,864 B2	IPR2015-00364 IPR2015-00380 IPR2015-00383
8,594,651 B2	IPR2015-00387 IPR2015-00388 IPR2015-00389
7,742,759 B2	IPR2015-00390