

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

LINKPLAY TECHNOLOGY INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SONOS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00509 (Patent 10,853,023 B2)
IPR2025-00510 (Patent 10,541,883 B2)
IPR2025-00511 (Patent 9,213,357 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

IPR2025-00509 (Patent 10,853,023 B2)
IPR2025-00510 (Patent 10,541,883 B2)
IPR2025-00511 (Patent 9,213,357 B2)

Sonos, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 7, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Linkplay Technology Inc. (“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 for each of these cases is October 11, 2026. DD Req. 9. The district court’s scheduled trial date is August 10, 2026. *Id.* Although time-to-trial statistics suggest trial would begin in November 2026, the parties have agreed to the August trial date. *Id.* at 10. Furthermore, the district court judge has indicated an intention to maintain the current trial schedule and only delay the trial schedule under extraordinary circumstances. *Id.* (citing Ex. 2106, 5; Ex. 2107, 37:22—38:3). As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in these proceedings will issue before the district court trial occurs, resulting in duplication of effort, additional expense for the parties, and a risk of inconsistent decisions.

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 IPR2025-00509. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00510 and IPR2025-00511.

IPR2025-00509 (Patent 10,853,023 B2)

IPR2025-00510 (Patent 10,541,883 B2)

IPR2025-00511 (Patent 9,213,357 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.

IPR2025-00509 (Patent 10,853,023 B2)
IPR2025-00510 (Patent 10,541,883 B2)
IPR2025-00511 (Patent 9,213,357 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Gang (Gavin) Ye
Andrew Landers Ramos
Jiayu (Mandy) Song
BAYES PLLC
gavin.ye@bayes.law
andrew.ramos@bayes.law
mandy.song@bayes.law

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Jaeyoung Pak
Michael P. Boyea
John Dan Smith
Cole B. Richter
Andrew G. Gerla
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP
pak@ls3ip.com
boyea@ls3ip.com
smith@ls3ip.com
richter@ls3ip.com
gerla@ls3ip.com