

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GLOBALFOUNDRIES U.S. INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00880
Case IPR2017-00881
Case IPR2017-00882
Case IPR2017-00883¹
Patent 6,197,696 B1

Before JUSTIN T. ARBES, MICHAEL J. FITZPATRICK, and
JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Petitioner's Unopposed Motions to Dismiss
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5(a) and 42.71(a)

¹ This Decision addresses an issue pertaining to all four cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue a single Decision to be entered in each case.

Pursuant to our authorization, Petitioner filed a motion to dismiss the petition in each of the instant proceedings. *See* IPR2017-00880, Paper 8 (“Mot.”); IPR2017-00881, Paper 8; IPR2017-00882, Paper 8; IPR2017-00883, Paper 8.² Petitioner states that it filed a second set of petitions in Cases IPR2017-00921, IPR2017-00922, IPR2017-00923, and IPR2017-00924 that include the same challenges and cited evidence as the petitions in the instant proceedings, but identify an additional real party-in-interest (GlobalFoundries, Inc.). Mot. 1–3. Petitioner does not identify any other differences between the original and new petitions. Petitioner argues that dismissal of the petitions in the instant proceedings “would preserve the Board’s and the parties’ resources” and would not prejudice Patent Owner. *Id.* at 2–3. Petitioner further states that Patent Owner does not oppose the motions. *Id.* at 2.

The instant proceedings are in the preliminary stage. Patent Owner has yet to file preliminary responses, and the Board has not decided whether to institute a trial based on any of the petitions. Dismissal of the petitions in the instant proceedings at this early juncture would minimize the burden on the parties and the Board, and would “secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution” of both sets of proceedings.³ *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b). Based on the specific facts of these proceedings, we determine that it is appropriate to dismiss the petitions. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5(a), 42.71(a).

² The motions to dismiss present similar arguments and similar facts. We refer to the motion filed in Case IPR2017-00880 for convenience.

³ The parties have not settled their dispute.

IPR2017-00880, IPR2017-00881, IPR2017-00882, IPR2017-00883
Patent 6,197,696 B1

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner's unopposed motion to dismiss in each of the instant proceedings is *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the petition in each of the instant proceedings is dismissed under 37 C.F.R. § 42.71(a).

IPR2017-00880, IPR2017-00881, IPR2017-00882, IPR2017-00883
Patent 6,197,696 B1

PETITIONER:

Christopher P. Carroll
Shamita Etienne-Cummings
WHITE & CASE LLP
christopher.carroll@whitecase.com
setienne@whitecase.com

PATENT OWNER:

Andrew N. Thomases
Jordan M. Rossen
James L. Davis, Jr.
ROPES & GRAY LLP
andrew.thomases@ropesgray.com
jordan.rossen@ropesgray.com
james.l.davis@ropesgray.com

J. Steven Baughman
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
sbaughman@paulweiss.com