

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TOYOTA MOTOR CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

INNOVATIVE DISPLAY TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00828
Case IPR2015-00829
Case IPR2015-00831
Case IPR2015-00832
Case IPR2015-00834
Case IPR2015-00835
Case IPR2015-00843
Case IPR2015-00855
Case IPR2015-00857
Case IPR2015-00895
Case IPR2015-00896
Case IPR2015-00897

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

GIANNETTI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

Case IPR2015-00828
Case IPR2015-00829
Case IPR2015-00831
Case IPR2015-00832

Case 2015-00834
Case 2015-00835
Case 2015-00843
Case 2015-00855

Case 2015-00857
Case 2015-00895
Case 2015-00896
Case 2015-00897

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

On May 26, 2015, the parties filed a joint motion to terminate each of these proceedings pursuant to a settlement agreement. Paper 6.¹ 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 1012. 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 7. At the request of the panel, the parties also filed the order of the district court, dismissing the related district court case against Petitioner. Exhibit 1013.

These proceedings are in the preliminary stage. The Board has not determined whether trial will be instituted. Further, the deadline to file a patent owner preliminary response is almost a month away, and no motions are pending. The parties submit that termination is appropriate because the parties have settled their dispute, and the Board has not entered a decision regarding institution. Paper 6, 5.

Upon consideration of the requests before us, we determine that terminating these proceedings with respect to both Petitioner and Patent Owner, at this early juncture, promotes efficiency and minimizes

¹ Paper and exhibit numbers refer to Case IPR2015-00828. Corresponding motions and settlement agreements were filed in each of the other cases.

Case IPR2015-00828
Case IPR2015-00829
Case IPR2015-00831
Case IPR2015-00832

Case 2015-00834
Case 2015-00835
Case 2015-00843
Case 2015-00855

Case 2015-00857
Case 2015-00895
Case 2015-00896
Case 2015-00897

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.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the joint motions to terminate the following cases are *granted*: Case IPR 2015-00828; Case IPR 2015-00829; Case IPR 2015-00831; Case IPR 2015-00832; Case IPR 2015-00834; Case IPR 2015-00835; Case IPR 2015-00843; Case IPR 2015-00855; Case IPR 2015-00857; Case IPR 2015-00895; Case IPR 2015-00896; and Case IPR 2015-00897;

FURTHER ORDERED that the above cases are hereby *terminated* as to all parties, including Petitioner 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*.

Case IPR2015-00828
Case IPR2015-00829
Case IPR2015-00831
Case IPR2015-00832

Case 2015-00834
Case 2015-00835
Case 2015-00843
Case 2015-00855

Case 2015-00857
Case 2015-00895
Case 2015-00896
Case 2015-00897

PETITIONER:

Thomas W. Winland
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, LLP
tom.winland@finnegan.com

PATENT OWNER:

George W. Webb III
Ahmad, Zavitsanos, Anaipakos, Alavi & Mensing P.C.
gwebb@azalaw.com