

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

KANGXI COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES (SHANGHAI) CO.,
LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

SKYWORKS SOLUTIONS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00372 (Patent 9,917,563 B2)
IPR2025-00373 (Patent 8,717,101 B2)

Before COKE MORGAN STEWART, *Acting Under Secretary of
Commerce for Intellectual Property and Acting Director of the United States
Patent and Trademark Office.*

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

IPR2025-00372 (Patent 9,917,563 B2)

IPR2025-00373 (Patent 8,717,101 B2)

Skyworks Solutions, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 7, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Kangxi Communication Technologies (Shanghai) Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 9, “DD Opp.”).¹

After considering the parties’ arguments and the record, and in view of all relevant considerations, discretionary denial of institution is appropriate in these proceedings. This determination is based on the totality of the evidence and arguments the parties have presented.

In particular, the projected final written decision due date in the Board proceedings is in August of 2026. DD Req. 12. The ITC hearing is scheduled to begin July 9, 2025, and the final determination is scheduled for March 23, 2026. *Id.*; Ex. 2001, 3; Ex. 2002, 7. As such, it is unlikely that final written decisions in these proceedings will issue before the final determination. Additionally, the challenged patents have been in force for more than 7 and 14 years, respectively, creating strong settled expectations, and Petitioner does not provide any persuasive reasoning why an *inter partes* review is an appropriate use of Board resources under these circumstances. *Dabico Airport Sols. Inc. v. AXA Power ApS*, IPR2025-00408, Paper 21 at 2–3 (Director June 18, 2025).

Although certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is based on a holistic assessment of all of the evidence and arguments presented. Accordingly, the Petitions are denied under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

¹ Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00372. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00373.

IPR2025-00372 (Patent 9,917,563 B2)

IPR2025-00373 (Patent 8,717,101 B2)

ORDERED that Patent Owner's requests for discretionary denial are *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Petitions are *denied*, and no trial is instituted.

IPR2025-00372 (Patent 9,917,563 B2)

IPR2025-00373 (Patent 8,717,101 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

John Baird

Patrick McPherson

DUANE MORRIS LLP

jmbaird@duanemorris.com

pdmcperson@duanemorris.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Joseph Haag

Haixia Lin

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING

HALE AND DORR, LLP

joseph.haag@wilmerhale.com

haixia.lin@wilmerhale.com