

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

YANGTZE MEMORY TECHNOLOGIES COMPANY, LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00498 (Patent 8,803,214 B2)
IPR2025-00499 (Patent 8,803,214 B2)
IPR2025-00500 (Patent 10,475,737 B2)
IPR2025-00501 (Patent 10,373,974 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>.

IPR2025-00498 (Patent 8,803,214 B2)
IPR2025-00499 (Patent 8,803,214 B2)
IPR2025-00500 (Patent 10,475,737 B2)
IPR2025-00501 (Patent 10,373,974 B2)

Micron Technology, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 7, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Yangtze Memory Technologies Company, Ltd. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 9, “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.

Some factors counsel against discretionary denial. For example, the parties are not currently engaged in a parallel proceeding involving the challenged patents. DD Opp. 12–13. As a result, there is no immediate concern of inconsistent outcomes or significant duplication of efforts resulting from two proceedings operating in parallel.

Other factors, however, favor discretionary denial. In particular, the challenged patents have been in force for approximately ten, six, and six years, respectively, creating strong settled expectations for Patent Owner, and Petitioner does not provide persuasive reasoning why an *inter partes* review is an appropriate use of Board resources. *Dabico Airport Sols. Inc. v. AXA Power ApS*, IPR2025-00408, Paper 21 at 2–3 (Director June 18, 2025). In the absence of any such information, the Office is disinclined to disturb the strong settled expectations of Patent Owner.

Although certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is based on a holistic assessment of

² Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00498. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00499, IPR2025-00500, and IPR2025-00501.

IPR2025-00498 (Patent 8,803,214 B2)
IPR2025-00499 (Patent 8,803,214 B2)
IPR2025-00500 (Patent 10,475,737 B2)
IPR2025-00501 (Patent 10,373,974 B2)

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.

IPR2025-00498 (Patent 8,803,214 B2)
IPR2025-00499 (Patent 8,803,214 B2)
IPR2025-00500 (Patent 10,475,737 B2)
IPR2025-00501 (Patent 10,373,974 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Zhiwei Zou
Wenchong Shu
Jiayu Song
BAYES PLLC
wayne.zou@bayes.law
wenchong.shu@bayes.law
mandy.song@bayes.law

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Travis Jensen
Jeremy Lang
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
ptabdocketjl2@orrick.com
t61ptabdocket@orrick.com