

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SONY CORPORATION, SONY CORPORATION OF AMERICA,  
SONY ELECTRONICS, INC., SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS  
(USA) INC., SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS AB, and  
SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS INC.,  
Petitioners,

v.

INNOVATIVE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGIES LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-00745  
Case IPR2015-00749  
Case IPR2015-00752  
Case IPR2015-00753  
Case IPR2015-00755  
Case IPR2015-00756  
Case IPR2015-00757

---

Before LORA M. GREEN, THOMAS L. GIANNETTI,  
MIRIAM L. QUINN, BEVERLY M. BUNTING, and MICHELLE M.  
WORMMEESTER, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

GIANNETTI, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

JUDGMENT  
Termination of Proceedings  
37 C.F.R. § 42.72

On August 11, 2015, the parties filed a joint motion to terminate each of these proceedings pursuant to a settlement agreement. Paper 10.<sup>1</sup> The parties also filed true copies of their written settlement agreement, made in connection with the termination of these proceedings, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b). Exhibit 1029. Additionally, the parties submitted joint requests to have their settlement agreement treated as confidential business information under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). Paper 11.

These proceedings are in the preliminary stages. No trial proceedings are instituted. No depositions have been taken. Paper 10, 1. The parties submit that termination is appropriate because the parties have settled their dispute and have reached agreement to terminate all of these IPRs. Paper 10, 1–2. The parties represent that the settlement agreement ends all patent disputes between the parties including their pending district court litigation, where a notice of settlement has been filed. Paper 10, 3.

Upon consideration of the requests before us, we determine that terminating these proceedings with respect to both Petitioners and Patent Owner, at this early juncture, promotes efficiency and minimizes unnecessary costs. Based on the facts of these cases, it is appropriate to enter judgment terminating the proceedings without rendering a final written decision. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 317(a); 37 C.F.R. § 42.72.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper and exhibit numbers refer to Case IPR2015-00745. Corresponding motions and settlement agreements were filed in each of the other cases.

IPR2015-00745  
IPR2015-00749  
IPR2015-00752

IPR2015-00753  
IPR2015-00755

IPR2015-00756  
IPR2015-00757

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the joint motions to terminate the following cases are *granted*: Case IPR2015-00745; Case IPR2015-00749; Case IPR2015-00752; Case IPR2015-00753; Case IPR2015-00755; Case IPR2015-00756; and Case IPR2015-00757.

FURTHER ORDERED that the above cases are hereby *terminated* as to all parties, including Petitioners and Patent Owner; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' joint requests that the 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), are *granted*.

IPR2015-00745  
IPR2015-00749  
IPR2015-00752

IPR2015-00753  
IPR2015-00755

IPR2015-00756  
IPR2015-00757

PETITIONER:

Gregory Gewirtz  
[ggewirtz.ipr@ldlkm.com](mailto:ggewirtz.ipr@ldlkm.com)

Scott McKeown  
[cpdocketmckeown@oblon.com](mailto:cpdocketmckeown@oblon.com)

Jonathan David  
[jdavid.ipr@ldlkm.com](mailto:jdavid.ipr@ldlkm.com)

Robert Hander  
[rhander.ipr@ldlkm.com](mailto:rhander.ipr@ldlkm.com)

PATENT OWNER:

Justin Kimble  
[JKimble-IPR@bcpc-law.com](mailto:JKimble-IPR@bcpc-law.com)