

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

---

AMAZON.COM, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

KAIFI LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2025-00624 (Patent 8,040,232 B2)  
IPR2025-00625 (Patent 8,930,196 B2)  
IPR2025-00626 (Patent 11,082,518 B2)  
IPR2025-00627 (Patent 7,689,001 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

IPR2025-00624 (Patent 8,040,232 B2)  
IPR2025-00625 (Patent 8,930,196 B2)  
IPR2025-00626 (Patent 11,082,518 B2)  
IPR2025-00627 (Patent 7,689,001 B2)

KAIFI LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 10, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned cases, and Amazon.com, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 15, “DD Opp.”).<sup>1</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 for each of these cases is October 11, 2026. DD Req. 3. The district court’s scheduled trial date is March 16, 2026. *Id.* The time-to-trial statistics suggest that the trial would begin in September 2026. *Id.*; DD Opp. 35 (citing Ex. 1063). Although the court has granted the parties’ Joint Motion to Stay All Deadlines and Notice of Settlement, the stay is limited to 45 days from the grant of the order. Ex. 1058. Thus, even if the district court trial date is delayed by 45 days, it is unlikely that a final written decision in this proceeding will issue before the scheduled district court trial, and the close proximity of a final written decision to the projected trial date (accounting for a 45 day delay) would result in the significant duplication of effort, additional expenses for the parties, and a risk of inconsistent decisions. Furthermore, the patents challenged in IPR2025-00624, IPR2025-00625, and IPR2025-00627 have been in force for approximately fourteen, ten, and fifteen years, respectively, creating strong settled

---

<sup>1</sup> Citations are to papers in IPR2025-00624. The parties filed similar papers in IPR2025-00625, IPR2025-00626, and IPR2025-00627.

IPR2025-00624 (Patent 8,040,232 B2)  
IPR2025-00625 (Patent 8,930,196 B2)  
IPR2025-00626 (Patent 11,082,518 B2)  
IPR2025-00627 (Patent 7,689,001 B2)

expectations for Patent Owner. These considerations weigh in favor of discretionary denial.

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.

IPR2025-00624 (Patent 8,040,232 B2)  
IPR2025-00625 (Patent 8,930,196 B2)  
IPR2025-00626 (Patent 11,082,518 B2)  
IPR2025-00627 (Patent 7,689,001 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Scott Jarratt  
Brian Kwok  
Brett Bostrom  
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
scott.jarratt.ipr@haynesboone.com  
brian.kwok.ipr@haynesboone.com  
brett.bostrom.ipr@haynesboone.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Matthew Phillips  
Kevin Laurence  
Derek Meeker  
Joseph Hawkins  
Daniel Higgs  
LAURENCE & PHILLIPS IP LAW  
mphillips@lpiplaw.com  
klaurence@lpiplaw.com  
dmeeker@lpiplaw.com  
joe@hawkins-ip.com  
dhiggs@lpiplaw.com