

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.,  
Petitioner,

v.

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2025-00481 (Patent 11,096,055 B2)  
IPR2025-00483 (Patent 9,609,510 B2)  
IPR2025-00484 (Patent 9,609,510 B2)

---

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE,<sup>1</sup> *Acting Deputy Chief Administrative  
Patent Judge.*

DECISION  
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>.

IPR2025-00481 (Patent 11,096,055 B2)

IPR2025-00483 (Patent 9,609,510 B2)

IPR2025-00484 (Patent 9,609,510 B2)

Headwater Research LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 7, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 8, “DD Opp.”).<sup>2</sup>

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 October 16, 2026. *See* DD Req. 15. The district court’s scheduled trial date is February 9, 2026, and the time-to-trial statistics suggest trial will begin in June 2026. *Id.* at 13; DD Opp. 15–16; Ex. 2002; Ex. 2003. As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in these proceedings will issue before district court trial occurs, resulting in significant duplication of effort, additional expense for the parties, and a risk of inconsistent decisions. Additionally, there is insufficient evidence that the district court is likely to stay its proceeding even if the Board were to institute trial.

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:

---

<sup>2</sup> Citations are to the papers in IPR2025-00481. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00483 and IPR2025-00484.

IPR2025-00481 (Patent 11,096,055 B2)

IPR2025-00483 (Patent 9,609,510 B2)

IPR2025-00484 (Patent 9,609,510 B2)

ORDERED that Patent Owner's request for discretionary denial is *granted*; and

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

IPR2025-00481 (Patent 11,096,055 B2)

IPR2025-00483 (Patent 9,609,510 B2)

IPR2025-00484 (Patent 9,609,510 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

W. Karl Renner

Jeremy Monaldo

Usman Khan

FISH & RICARDSON P.C.

axf-ptab@fr.com

jjm@fr.com

khan@fr.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Reza Mirzaie

Dale Chang

James Milkey

Neil Rubin

Philip Wang

RUSS AUGUST & KABAT

rmirzaie@raklaw.com

dchang@raklaw.com

jmilkey@raklaw.com

nrubin@raklaw.com

pwang@raklaw.com