

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ZTE (USA) INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

PAPST LICENSING GMBH & CO. KG  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00713  
Patent 6,895,449

---

**JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 317 AND 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72 AND 42.74**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317, 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72 and 42.74, and the Board's authorization of January 12, 2018, Petitioner ZTE (USA) Inc. ("ZTE") and Patent Owner Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG ("Patent Owner" or "Papst") jointly move to terminate the present *inter partes* review proceeding in light of Patent Owner and ZTE's settlement of their disputes.

ZTE and Patent Owner are concurrently filing a true and complete copy of their written Settlement Agreement in connection with this matter as required by statute. ZTE and Patent Owner certify that there are no other agreements or understandings, oral or written, between the parties, including any collateral agreements, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of the present proceeding. A joint request to treat the Settlement Agreement as business confidential information kept separate from the file of the involved patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) is being filed concurrently.

## **LEGAL STANDARD**

An *inter partes* review proceeding “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 . . . If no petitioner remains in the inter partes review, the Office may terminate the review or proceed to a final written decision under section 318(a).” 35 U.S.C. § 317(a). A joint motion to terminate generally “must (1) include a brief explanation as to why termination is appropriate; (2) identify all parties in any related litigation involving the patents at issue; (3) identify any related proceedings currently before the Office, and (4) discuss specifically the current status of each such related litigation or proceeding with respect to each party to the litigation or proceeding.” *Heartland Tanning, Inc. v. Sunless, Inc.*, IPR2014-00018, Paper No. 26, at \*2 (P.T.A.B. July 28, 2014).

## **ARGUMENT**

Termination of the present *inter partes* review proceeding is appropriate because (1) ZTE and Patent Owner have settled their disputes and have agreed to terminate the proceeding, (2) the Office has not yet decided the merits of the proceeding, and (3) public policy favors the termination.

*First*, the Settlement Agreement completely resolves the controversy between Patent Owner and ZTE relating to the '449 patent. ZTE (USA) Inc. and ZTE

Corporation, which are the real parties in interest in the present proceeding, were named defendants in *Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG v. Apple Inc.*, No. 6:15-cv-1095-RWS (E.D. Tex) and the consolidated case *Papst Licensing GmbH & Co. KG v. ZTE Corporation and ZTE (USA), Inc.*, No. 6:15-cv-1100-RWS (E.D. Tex.). On December 29, 2017, ZTE and Patent Owner filed a joint motion to dismiss with prejudice all asserted claims against the ZTE entities and all asserted counterclaims by the ZTE entities.

*Second*, although the Board has instituted trial (Paper 8), the Office has not decided the merits of the proceeding.

*Third*, public policy favors the termination. As recognized by the rules of practice before the Board:

There are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding. The Board will be available to facilitate settlement discussions, and where appropriate, may require a settlement discussion as part of the proceeding. The Board expects that a proceeding will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement, unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding.

Patent Office Trial Practice Guide, Fed. Register, Vol. 77, No. 157 at 48768 (Aug. 14, 2012). Moreover, no public interest or other factors militate against termination of this proceeding, as no parties will remain in the proceeding.

As to the remaining *Heartland Tanning* requirements, Exhibit A identifies each district court litigation that involves the '449 patent or any related patents and

discusses the current status of these related litigations. Exhibit B identifies all petitions for *Inter Partes* Review that have been filed against the '449 patent or any related patent and discusses the status of each.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, ZTE and Patent Owner jointly and respectfully request that the instant proceeding be terminated.

Date: January 12, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Nicholas T. Peters/

Nicholas T. Peters

Registration No. 53,456

Paul B. Henkelmann

Registration No. 65,891

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY,  
LLP

120 S. LaSalle Street, Suite 1600

Chicago, IL 60603

*Attorneys for Patent Owner Papst  
Licensing GmbH & Co. KG*

By: /Scott R. Miller/

Scott R. Miller

Registration No. 32,276

Darren Franklin

Registration No. 51,701

SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER &  
HAMPTON, LLP

333 South Hope Street, 43<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90071

(213) 620-1780

# 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.