

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.¹,
Petitioner,

v.

SMARTFLASH LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case CBM2015-00018
Patent 7,942,317 B2

Before JENNIFER S. BISK, RAMA G. ELLURU,
JEREMY M. PLENZIER, and MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS,
Administrative Patent Judges.

ELLURU, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION
Motion to Terminate
37 C.F.R. § 42.72

¹ Apple has been dismissed as a Petitioner. Paper 37, 8.

On April 10, 2015, we instituted a transitional covered business method patent review (Paper 15, “Institution Decision” or “Inst. Dec.”) based upon Apple’s assertion that claim 18 (“the challenged claim”) is directed to patent ineligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Inst. Dec. 13. We subsequently dismissed Apple as a petitioner in this trial (Paper 37, 8) because Apple was the petitioner in CBM2014-00112 that resulted in a final written decision with respect to claim 18, the same claim challenged in this trial. *Id.* at 7; *see* 35 U.S.C. 325(e)(1) (“The petitioner in a post-grant review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 328(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not request or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to that claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that post-grant review.”). Thus, we determined that under 35 U.S.C. § 325(e)(1), Apple is estopped from participating further in this trial. *Id.* at 2–7.

Nonetheless, we decided to proceed to a Final Written Decision because § 325(e)(1) speaks only to actions that may not be undertaken by Petitioner (or its real party in interest or privy), but does not proscribe actions that may be taken by the panel. Paper 37, 5–7. On March 15, 2016, however, Patent Owner filed an authorized motion to terminate this proceeding stating that “[o]n March 4, 2016, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 42(b), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit dismissed [Patent Owner’s] appeal of [the final written decision in CBM2014-00112 determining] that claim 18 of the ’317 Patent is unpatentable.” Paper 45, 3.

We are persuaded that the particular facts of this proceeding now counsel termination. 37 C.F.R. § 42.72. Claim 18 of the ’317 patent has

Case CBM2015-00018
Patent 7,942,317 B2

been finally cancelled and any decision we might reach in this proceeding regarding the patentability of this claim would be moot and purely advisory. We do not see how the just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of every proceeding (37 C.F.R. § 42.1(b)) would be secured by rendering a final written decision in this case.

ORDER

Accordingly it is

ORDERED that Patent Owner's motion to terminate this proceeding is *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that CBM2015-00018 is terminated.

Case CBM2015-00018

Patent 7,942,317 B2

PETITIONER (Dismissed):

J. Steven Baughman

Ching-Lee Fukuda

ROPES & GRAY LLP

steven.baughman@ropesgray.com

ching-lee.fukuda@ropesgray.com

PATENT OWNER:

Michael R. Casey

J. Scott Davidson

DAVIDSON BERQUIST JACKSON & GOWDEY LLP

mcasey@dbjg.com

jsd@dbjg.com