

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DISH NETWORK CORPORATION AND DISH NETWORK L.L.C.
Petitioners,

v.

IPA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2018-00351
U.S. Patent No. 6,757,718

JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 317

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74, DISH Network Corporation and DISH Network L.L.C. (“Petitioners”) and Patent Owner IPA Technologies, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) jointly request termination of this *inter partes* review (IPR) of 6,757,718 (“718 patent”), Case No. IPR2018-00351, and termination of the proceeding with respect to Petitioner. The parties note that the Decision on Institution is pending, and this Joint Motion is filed prior to the deadline for Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response.

The parties have settled and have reached agreement to terminate this IPR. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(b), the parties received authorization from the Board to file this motion on April 16, 2018.

Termination of this proceeding is proper for at least the following reasons:

- The parties are jointly requesting termination. 77 Fed. Reg. 48756, 48768 (Aug. 14, 2012) (“There are **strong public policy reasons to favor settlement** between the parties to a proceeding.”) (emphasis added). Both Congress and the federal courts have expressed a strong interest in encouraging settlement in litigation. *See, e.g., Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. August*, 450 U.S. 346, 352 (1981) (“The purpose of [Fed. R. Civ. P.] 68 is to encourage the settlement of litigation.”); *Bergh v. Dept. of Transp.*, 794 F.2d 1575, 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (“The law favors settlement of cases.”), *cert. denied*, 479 U.S. 950 (1986). The Federal Circuit places a particularly strong emphasis on settlement. *See*

Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe v. U.S., 806 F.2d 1046, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (noting that the law favors settlement to reduce antagonism and hostility between parties). Here, no public interest or other factors weigh against termination of this proceeding.

- The Board has not yet “decided the merits of the proceeding **before the request for termination is filed.**” 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) (emphasis added); 77 Fed. Reg. 48768 (“The Board expects that a proceeding will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding.”) Indeed, the Board has not yet made a decision on institution of this *inter partes* review. Petitioners filed their petition for *inter partes* review on January 26, 2018. No Motions are outstanding in this proceeding. No other party’s rights will be prejudiced by the termination of this *inter partes* review. This supports the propriety of terminating this proceeding even though the settlement and termination provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 317, on their face, apply only to “instituted” proceedings. 77 Fed. Reg. 48680, 48686 (Aug. 14, 2012) (And 35 U.S.C. 317(a) provides “An *inter partes* review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the

patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed.”)

- In *IPA Technologies Inc. v. DISH Network Corporation et al.*, No. 1-16-cv-01170 (D. Del.) the parties are moving to dismiss the case. The settlement also calls for IPA Technologies Inc. and DISH Network Corporation et al. to jointly request termination of the proceeding before the Board involving the ‘718 patent (i.e., IPR2018-00351).

The following proceedings are related to the ‘718 patent:

IPA Technologies Inc. v. Google LLC, 1-18-cv-00318 (D. Del. filed Feb. 26, 2018);
IPA Technologies Inc. v. Microsoft Corporation, 1-18-cv-00001 (D. Del. filed Jan. 2, 2018); *Google LLC v. IPA Technologies Inc.*, IPR2018-00384 (PTAB Dec. 22, 2017);
IPA Technologies Inc. v. Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. et al., 1-17-cv-00248 (D. Del. filed Mar. 9, 2017); *IPA Technologies Inc. v. LG Electronics Inc. et al.*, No. 1-17-cv-00121 (D. Del. filed Feb. 3, 2017); *IPA Technologies Inc. v. Sony Electronics Inc., et al.*, No. 1-17-cv-00055 (D. Del. filed Jan. 19, 2017); *IPA Technologies Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al.*, No. 1-16-cv-01266 (D. Del. filed Dec. 19, 2016); *IPA Technologies Inc. v. TCL Communication Technology Holdings, Ltd. et al.*, No. 1-16-cv-01236 (D. Del. filed Dec. 16, 2016); *IPA Technologies Inc. v. DISH Network Corporation et al.*, No. 1-16-cv-01170 (D. Del. filed Dec. 9, 2016).

The settlement agreement between the parties has been made in writing, and a true and correct copy will be filed with this request as Exhibit 1035.

Aside from the settlement agreement, the parties confirm that there are no other “collateral agreements referred to in such agreement or understanding, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of [the] inter partes review.” 35 U.S.C. § 317(b).

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.