

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING COMPANY LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

GODO KAISHA IP BRIDGE 1,
Patent Owner.

Cases IPR2017-01843 and IPR2017-01844
Patent 7,893,501 B2

Before MELISSA A. HAAPALA, *Acting Vice Chief Administrative Patent Judge*, and JUSTIN T. ARBES, and JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Termination of the Proceedings
35 U.S.C. § 317; 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72, 42.74

On February 6, 2018, Case IPR2017-01844 was consolidated with Case IPR2017-01843, and an *inter partes* review was instituted as to challenged claims 1, 4–7, 9–13, 15–19, 21, and 23–25 of U.S. Patent No. 7,893,501 B2 (“the ’501 patent”).¹ Paper 10²; IPR2017-01844, Paper 10. The parties have filed numerous papers in this case, and we held an oral hearing on September 6, 2018. Although the proceedings are at a late stage of the trial, we have not yet entered a final written decision on the merits.

On January 22, 2019, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a), the parties filed a Joint Motion to Terminate these proceedings. Paper 48 (“Motion”). In the Motion, the parties indicate that they have reached a settlement related to the ’501 patent, and that there are no longer any disputes between the parties involving this patent. *Id.* at 1. The parties also filed a true copy of a settlement agreement along with a Joint Request to treat the settlement agreement as confidential, to be kept separate from the patent file under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74. Paper 49; Ex. 2235. We authorized the filing of these papers in an e-mail sent on January 14, 2019.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 317(a), 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 Patent and Trademark Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed. As previously noted, a final written decision on the merits has not yet

¹ The parties incorrectly indicate that “[t]he merits have not been decided because this proceeding is in a preliminary stage, that is, no decision on institution has been entered.” Paper 48, 1.

² Unless otherwise indicated, all citations are to papers and exhibits in IPR2017-01843.

IPR2017-01843, IPR2017-01844
Patent 7,893,501 B2

been entered. We, thus, determine it is appropriate to terminate the proceedings. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72, 42.74; *see also* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,768 (Aug. 14, 2012) (indicating there are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding). The Joint Motion to Terminate the proceedings is granted.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the parties' Joint Motion to Terminate the proceedings is granted;

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' Joint Request that the settlement agreement (Ex. 2235) be treated as business confidential information under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c), to be 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, is granted; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the proceedings are terminated.

IPR2017-01843, IPR2017-01844
Patent 7,893,501 B2

PETITIONER:

David L. Cavanaugh
Dominic E. Massa
Michael H. Smith
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
david.cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com
dominic.massa@wilmerhale.com
michaelh.smith@wilmerhale.com

PATENT OWNER:

Gerald B. Hrycyszyn
Richard F. Giunta
Edmund J. Walsh
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
ghrycyszyn-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com
rgiunta-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com
ewalsh-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com