

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC. and SONY GROUP CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

SIONYX, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00845
Patent 10,224,359 B2

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, GEORGE R. HOSKINS, and
MONICA S. ULLAGADDI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ULLAGADDI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Dismissal Prior to Institution of Trial
35 U.S.C. § 314

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 16, 2025, Apple Inc. and Sony Group Corp. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition in IPR2025-00845 (Paper 3) requesting *inter partes* review of certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,224,359 B2. With the Board’s authorization, Petitioner filed a Motion to Withdraw Petition for *Inter Partes* Review. Paper 7 (“Motion”). In the Motion, Petitioner seeks to withdraw the Petition and to terminate the case. Motion 1. SiOnyx, LLC (“Patent Owner”) has not yet filed a Preliminary Response to the Petition. Petitioner informs us that Patent Owner “does not oppose th[e] Motion.” *Id.* at 1.

II. DISCUSSION

Petitioner asserts the following:

Patent Owner has not submitted a POPR or any discretionary denial briefing, and the Board has not reached a decision on institution. This IPR remains in its infancy, as the deadline for Patent Owner to file its POPR is not until August 21, 2025. Notably, Patent Owner does not oppose this Motion to withdraw the Petition.

...

Further, termination of the instant IPR is appropriate because all pending disputes between the parties concerning the ’359 Patent have been resolved in the district court litigation, and the concurrent litigation has been dismissed.

Motion 2, 3 (citing Ex. 1083 (District Court’s Dismissal Order)). Petitioner argues that withdrawal of the Petitions “promotes efficiency and substantially conserves the Board’s and parties’ resources.” *Id.* at 2–3 (citing *Reolink Digital Technology Co., Ltd. v. KT Imagining USA, LLC*, IPR2024-01154, Paper 6, 2 (PTAB Sep. 23, 2024); *DirectTV, LLC v. Entropic Communications, LLC*, IPR2024-01063, Paper 8, 2–3 (PTAB Oct. 17, 2024)).

We find Petitioner’s arguments to be consistent with the records of this and the related cases. Under these circumstances, we determine that it is appropriate to

grant Petitioner's Motion to withdraw the Petition and terminate the proceeding.

III. ORDER

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is:

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion to withdraw its Petition for *inter partes* review in the above-identified proceeding is *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Petition in the above-identified proceeding is *dismissed* and the proceeding is *terminated* as to all parties.

IPR2025-00845
Patent 10,224,359 B2

For PETITIONER:

Matthew Smith
Elizabeth Laughton
SMITH BALUCH LLP
smith@smithbaluch.com
laughton@smithbaluch.com

Jennifer Bailey
ERISE IP, P.A.
jennifer.bailey@eriseip.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Alison McCarthy
Dustin Ferzacca
TROUTMAN PEPPER LOCKE LLP
alison.mccarthy@troutman.com
dustin.ferzacca@troutman.com