

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.

FOUR BATONS WIRELESS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00493 (Patent 7,502,348 B2)
IPR2025-00494 (Patent 8,073,436 B2)
IPR2025-00495 (Patent 8,239,671 B2)
IPR2025-00496 (Patent 8,798,006 B2)

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

DECISION
Denying Institution of *Inter Partes* Review

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>.

IPR2025-00493 (Patent 7,502,348 B2)
IPR2025-00494 (Patent 8,073,436 B2)
IPR2025-00495 (Patent 8,239,671 B2)
IPR2025-00496 (Patent 8,798,006 B2)

Four Batons Wireless, 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. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 10, “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 September 23, 2026. DD Req. 5–6. The district court’s scheduled trial date is February 9, 2026, and the time-to-trial statistics suggest trial will begin in March 2026. DD Req. 5–7. 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 4–5, 9–14. Further, the challenged patents have been in force for over ten years, creating strong settled expectations, and Petitioner does not provide any persuasive reasoning why an *inter partes* review is an

² Unless indicated otherwise, citations are to papers in IPR2025-00493. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00494, IPR2025-00495, and IPR2025-00496.

IPR2025-00493 (Patent 7,502,348 B2)
IPR2025-00494 (Patent 8,073,436 B2)
IPR2025-00495 (Patent 8,239,671 B2)
IPR2025-00496 (Patent 8,798,006 B2)

appropriate use of Board resources. *Dabico Airport Solutions Inc. v. AXA Power ApS*, IPR2025-00408, Paper 21 at 2–3 (Director June 18, 2025).³

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 request for discretionary denial is *granted*; and

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

³ Although Petitioner asserts that it has a license to the challenged patents, in the absence of a license agreement in the record, this fact is unpersuasive. DD Opp. 15 (citing Ex. 2011, 7, 23).

IPR2025-00493 (Patent 7,502,348 B2)
IPR2025-00494 (Patent 8,073,436 B2)
IPR2025-00495 (Patent 8,239,671 B2)
IPR2025-00496 (Patent 8,798,006 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

David Caine
Ali Sharifahmadian
Jeffrey Miller
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP
david.caine@arnoldporter.com
ali.sharifahmadian@arnoldporter.com
jeffrey.miller@apks.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Michael Heim
Christopher Limbacher
HAIM PAYNE & CHORUSH, LLP
mheim@hpcllp.com
climbacher@hpcllp.com