

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HP INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MEMJET TECHNOLOGY LIMITED,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00791
Patent 8,678,550 B2

Before JAMESON LEE, LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, and
JOHN F. HORVATH, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

LEE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Granting Joint Motion to Terminate
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72, 42.74

On July 6, 2016, the parties filed a joint motion to terminate this proceeding (Paper 7, "Mot."), as well as a joint request (Paper 8, "Req.") to have their settlement agreement treated as business confidential information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c). The parties also filed a copy of their settlement

agreement (Ex. 1011), which the parties represent is a true copy pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b). Mot. 1.

The parties indicate in their joint motion that they have reached an agreement resolving their dispute involving U.S. Patent No. 8,678,550 (“the ’550 patent”). *Id.* The parties further indicate they will move to dismiss a district court proceeding involving the ’550 patent that is also the subject of the parties’ settlement agreement, and that there are no other pending proceedings between the parties involving the ’550 patent. *Id.* at 2.

This proceeding is in a preliminary stage. No decision on whether to institute trial has been made. Under the circumstances presented here, we determine that it is appropriate to terminate this preliminary proceeding with respect to both Petitioner and Patent Owner. Accordingly, we grant the parties’ joint motion to terminate.

We also grant the parties’ joint request that the settlement agreement be treated as business confidential information, to be kept separate from the patent file. The parties further request that, “due to the highly sensitive nature of the agreement,” they be notified of any written request by a third party to the Board for a copy of the settlement agreement and be given an opportunity to respond. Mot. 1–2; Req. 1. That request is denied. No such notification or opportunity to respond is provided by Board’s rules, and the parties have not shown any special circumstance that applies to them as compared to all other parties filing settlement agreements with the Board.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the parties’ joint motion to terminate this proceeding is *granted*;

IPR2016-00791
Patent 8,678,550 B2

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' joint request that the settlement agreement (Ex. 1011) be treated as business confidential information, to be kept separate from the patent file, under 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c), is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' joint request to have them be given notice and opportunity to respond when a third party submits a written request for a copy of the settlement agreement is *denied*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that this proceeding is *terminated*.

FOR PETITIONER:

Dion M. Bregman
Andrew J. Gray IV
Bradford A. Cangro
Jacob A. Snodgrass
Archis (Neil) V. Ozarkar
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Dion.bregamn@morganlewis.com
Andrew.gray@morganlewis.com
Bradford.cangro@morganlewis.com
Jacob.snodgrass@morganlewis.com
Neil.ozarkar@morganlewis.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

James M. Glass
Marc L. Kaplan
John McKee
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com
marckaplan@quinnemanuel.com
johnmckee@quinnemanuel.com