

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.

MOBILE DATA TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2025-00537 (Patent 8,825,801 B2)  
IPR2025-00538 (Patent 8,825,801 B2)  
IPR2025-00539 (Patent 8,793,336 B2)  
IPR2025-00540 (Patent 8,793,336 B2)  
IPR2025-00541 (Patent 9,922,348 B2)  
IPR2025-00542 (Patent 9,922,348 B2)  
IPR2025-00543 (Patent 9,619,578 B2)  
IPR2025-00544 (Patent 9,619,578 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>.

IPR2025-00537 (Patent 8,825,801 B2)

IPR2025-00538 (Patent 8,825,801 B2)

IPR2025-00539 (Patent 8,793,336 B2)

IPR2025-00540 (Patent 8,793,336 B2)

IPR2025-00541 (Patent 9,922,348 B2)

IPR2025-00542 (Patent 9,922,348 B2)

IPR2025-00543 (Patent 9,619,578 B2)

IPR2025-00544 (Patent 9,619,578 B2)

Mobile Data Technologies, 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 11, “DD Opp.”).<sup>2</sup> With authorization, Patent Owner filed a Reply (Paper 13), and Petitioner filed a Sur-reply (Paper 14).

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 October 2026. DD Req. 30. The district court’s scheduled trial date is April 20, 2026, and the time-to-trial statistics suggest that trial would begin by August 2026. *Id.* at 30–31; DD Opp. 47; Ex. 1052, 35. As such, it is unlikely that a final written decision in these proceedings will issue before the 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00537. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00538, IPR2025-00539, IPR2025-00540, IPR2025-00541, IPR2025-00542, IPR2025-00543, and IPR2025-00544.

IPR2025-00537 (Patent 8,825,801 B2)

IPR2025-00538 (Patent 8,825,801 B2)

IPR2025-00539 (Patent 8,793,336 B2)

IPR2025-00540 (Patent 8,793,336 B2)

IPR2025-00541 (Patent 9,922,348 B2)

IPR2025-00542 (Patent 9,922,348 B2)

IPR2025-00543 (Patent 9,619,578 B2)

IPR2025-00544 (Patent 9,619,578 B2)

Further, the challenged patents have been in force for approximately ten, ten, eight, and eight years, respectively, creating strong settled expectations for Patent Owner.

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.

IPR2025-00537 (Patent 8,825,801 B2)

IPR2025-00538 (Patent 8,825,801 B2)

IPR2025-00539 (Patent 8,793,336 B2)

IPR2025-00540 (Patent 8,793,336 B2)

IPR2025-00541 (Patent 9,922,348 B2)

IPR2025-00542 (Patent 9,922,348 B2)

IPR2025-00543 (Patent 9,619,578 B2)

IPR2025-00544 (Patent 9,619,578 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Lori Gordon

Douglas Kline

Naomi Birbach

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

[gordon-ptab@goodwinlaw.com](mailto:gordon-ptab@goodwinlaw.com)

[dkline@goodwinprocter.com](mailto:dkline@goodwinprocter.com)

[nbirbach@goodwinlaw.com](mailto:nbirbach@goodwinlaw.com)

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Erick Robinson

Patrick Dunn

Homayoon Rafatijo

Jayne Piana

Jayne Partridge

BROWN RUDNICK LLP

[erobinson@brownrudnick.com](mailto:erobinson@brownrudnick.com)

[pdunn@brownrudnick.com](mailto:pdunn@brownrudnick.com)

[hrafatijo@brownrudnick.com](mailto:hrafatijo@brownrudnick.com)

[jpiana@brownrudnick.com](mailto:jpiana@brownrudnick.com)

[jpartridge@brownrudnick.com](mailto:jpartridge@brownrudnick.com)