

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

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD., and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

VASU HOLDINGS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00446 (Patent 8,886,181 B2)
IPR2025-00447 (Patent 10,206,154 B2)
IPR2025-00448 (Patent 10,368,281 B2)
IPR2025-00449 (Patent 10,368,281 B2)
IPR2025-00450 (Patent 10,419,996 B2)

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE,¹ *Acting Deputy Chief Administrative
Patent Judge.*

¹ Coke Morgan Stewart, Acting Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Acting Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, is recused and took no part in this decision. The Acting Director has delegated her authority in a Notice of Delegation. *See* <https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/deshpande-delegation-letter.pdf>.

IPR2025-00446 (Patent 8,886,181 B2)
IPR2025-00447 (Patent 10,206,154 B2)
IPR2025-00448 (Patent 10,368,281 B2)
IPR2025-00449 (Patent 10,368,281 B2)
IPR2025-00450 (Patent 10,419,996 B2)

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

Vasu Holdings, LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 8, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd. and Samsung Electronics, America, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 11, “DD Opp.”).²

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 for each of these cases is in August or September of 2026. DD Req. 10. The district court’s scheduled trial date is November 3, 2025, and the time-to-trial statistics accord with this date. *Id.* at 10–11. As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in these proceedings will issue before the district court trial occurs. Additionally, there is insufficient evidence that the district court is likely to stay its proceeding even if the Board were to institute trial, and there has been meaningful investment in the parallel proceeding by the parties. *Id.* at 6–10, 12–14. For example, the parties have completed claim construction briefing, a *Markman* hearing has occurred, a claim construction order has issued, and fact discovery has closed. *Id.* at 12–14; DD Opp. 10.

² Unless indicated otherwise, citations are to papers in IPR2025-00446. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00447, IPR2025-00448, IPR2025-00449, and IPR2025-00450.

IPR2025-00446 (Patent 8,886,181 B2)
IPR2025-00447 (Patent 10,206,154 B2)
IPR2025-00448 (Patent 10,368,281 B2)
IPR2025-00449 (Patent 10,368,281 B2)
IPR2025-00450 (Patent 10,419,996 B2)

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:

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

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

IPR2025-00446 (Patent 8,886,181 B2)
IPR2025-00447 (Patent 10,206,154 B2)
IPR2025-00448 (Patent 10,368,281 B2)
IPR2025-00449 (Patent 10,368,281 B2)
IPR2025-00450 (Patent 10,419,996 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

James Davis
Alexander Middleton
Christopher Bonny
ROPES & GRAY LLP
james.l.davis@ropesgray.com
alexander.middleton@ropesgray.com
christopher.bonny@ropesgray.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

James Hannah
Jeffrey Price
Kristopher Kastens
Jeffrey Eng
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP
jhannah@kramerlevin.com
jprice@kramerlevin.com
kkastens@kramerlevin.com
jeng@kramerlevin.com