

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BLUEHOUSE GLOBAL LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

SEMICONDUCTOR ENERGY LABORATORY CO., LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-01362 (Patent 8,492,840 B2)
Case IPR2018-01377 (Patent 9,281,405 B2)
Case IPR2018-01382 (Patent 9,601,603 B2)
Case IPR2018-01393 (Patent 9,293,545 B2)
Case IPR2018-01405 (Patent 9,298,057 B2)

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, JEAN R. HOMERE, KEVIN TURNER, and
STACEY G. WHITE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.¹

PER CURIAM.

JUDGMENT
Request for Adverse Judgment
37 C.F.R. § 42.73(b)(4)

¹ This is not a decision by an expanded panel of the Board; rather, this judgement addresses proceedings including of all listed judges.

IPR2018-01362 (Patent 8,492,840 B2)
IPR2018-01377 (Patent 9,281,405 B2)
IPR2018-01382 (Patent 9,601,603 B2)
IPR2018-01393 (Patent 9,293,545 B2)
IPR2018-01405 (Patent 9,298,057 B2)

DISCUSSION

On December 19, 2018, Petitioner BlueHouse sought authorization to terminate the pending proceedings in the above-referenced matters. Ex. 3001.² Upon further inquiry, Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively referred to as “the Parties”) represented that Petitioner requests adverse judgment under 37 C.F.R. § 42.74 (b)(4) in each of the above identified proceedings and that Patent Owner does not oppose. Ex. 3002.

On this record, we construe the parties’ email communications referenced above as unopposed Petitioner requests for entry of adverse judgment against Petitioner in the above-identified *inter partes* review proceedings. 37 C.F.R. § 42.74 (b)(4).

These cases are in the preliminary proceeding stage; no institution of a trial has been made.³ Based on the facts of these cases, it is appropriate to enter judgment in each of the above-identified proceedings.⁴

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s requests for adverse judgment in the above-identified proceedings are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that judgment is herein entered against Petitioner

² For purposes of expediency, we cite to the communication by Petitioner transmitted via email by the parties on December 19, 2018. Exhibit 3001 is representative of the separate electronic communications submitted by Petitioner in each of the above-identified proceedings.

³ A preliminary proceeding begins with the filing of a petition for instituting a trial and ends with a decision as to whether a trial will be instituted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.2.

⁴ A judgment means a final written decision by the Board, or a termination of a proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.2.

IPR2018-01362 (Patent 8,492,840 B2)
IPR2018-01377 (Patent 9,281,405 B2)
IPR2018-01382 (Patent 9,601,603 B2)
IPR2018-01393 (Patent 9,293,545 B2)
IPR2018-01405 (Patent 9,298,057 B2)

in the above identified proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the above-identified proceedings are
terminated.

PETITIONER:

Ryan O. White
Roshan P Shrestha
Philip R. Bautista
TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
rwhite@taftlaw.com
rshrestha@taftlaw.com
pbautista@taftlaw.com

PATENT OWNER:

Roberto J. Devoto
W. Karl Renner
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
devoto@fr.com
axf-ptab@fr.com

Eric Robinson
Stephen P. Catlin
ROBINSON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW OFFICE, P.C.
erobison@riplo.com
scatlin@riplo.com