

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BOE TECHNOLOGY GROUP CO., LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

PANELTOUCH TECHNOLOGIES LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case No.: IPR2025-01245

Patent 9,250,758

JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PROCEEDING

PATENT OWNER’S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

No.	Description
2001	Docket Navigator IPR Stay Statistics.
2002	Docket Navigator Judge Gilstrap Median Time-to-Trial Statistics.
2003	<i>Dabico Airport Solutions Inc. v. Axa Power Aps</i> , IPR2025-00408 (Paper 21).
2004	Director Squire’s October 28, 2025 Memorandum.
2005	Excerpts from “Entity List,” <i>Export Administration Regulations</i> , BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND SECURITY, available at https://www.bis.gov/regulations/ear/744#supplement-4-744 (last accessed Nov. 5, 2025).
2006	<i>Letter to U.S. International Trade Commission</i> , U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CHINESE PARTY (dated December 18, 2024).
2007	BOE Technology Ground Co., LTD. Annual Report 2024 (Summary).
2008	BOE Technology Ground Co., LTD. Annual Report 2024, available for download at https://www.boe.com/en/investorRelations/regularCompanyAnnouncements (last visited Nov. 6, 2025).
2009	<i>Primer on Important Amendments to the Chinese Company Law</i> , AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, https://www.americanbar.org/groups/franchising/resources/franchise-lawyer/2024-winter/primer-important-amendments-chinese-company-law/ (published Aug. 23, 2024).
2010	<i>Actual controllers with foreign residency rights and corporate tax avoidance: Evidence from private listed companies in China</i> , EMERGING MARKETS REVIEW VOL. 26, available at https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1566014125001207 (last accessed Nov. 5, 2025).
2011	<i>Legal Representative vs. Actual Controller: Who Really Runs a Chinese Company?</i> , CNBIZINSIGHT, available at https://cnbizinsight.com/legal-representative-vs-actual-controller-who-really-runs-a-chinese-company/ (last accessed Nov. 5, 2025).

Motion to Terminate — IPR2025-01245 — Patent No. 9,250,758

No.	Description
2012	<i>Yangtze Memory Tech. Co. Ltd. v. Micron Tech. Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00098, IPR2025-00099, Paper 33 (Nov. 10, 2025).
2013	Settlement Agreement (Parties and Board Only)

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74, Petitioner and Patent Owner (collectively, “the Parties”) jointly move to terminate the above-captioned inter partes review (“IPR”) proceeding, including withdrawal of the pending request for director review. The Board authorized the parties to file this motion by email on March 30, 2026.

The Parties have reached a settlement resolving their dispute regarding the patent at issue in this proceeding. A true and correct copy of the settlement agreement is being filed concurrently with this motion as required under 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b). *See* Ex. 2013.

A joint motion to terminate generally “must (1) include a brief explanation as to why termination is appropriate; (2) identify all parties in any related litigation involving the patents at issue; (3) identify any related proceedings currently before the Office; and (4) discuss specifically the current status of each such related litigation or proceeding with respect to each party to the litigation or proceeding.” *Heartland Tanning, Inc. v. Sunless, Inc.*, IPR2014-00018, Paper 26, at *2 (July 28, 2014).

Here, Petitioner and Patent Owner have settled their dispute regarding the ’758 patent, including both this proceeding and Patent Owner’s assertion of the ’758 patent in the related district court litigation. The parties do not anticipate further litigation between them concerning the ’758 patent. With respect to related

Motion to Terminate — IPR2025-01245 — Patent No. 9,250,758

proceedings, the parties have similarly settled their dispute with respect to U.S. Patent Nos. 8,803,836 and 11,126,025 and are concurrently filing a joint motion to terminate the corresponding IPR proceedings for those patents as well, i.e., IPR2025-01246 and -01267. The settlement also encompasses the patents at issue in IPR2024-01130, -01131, -01132, and -01133 (*BOE Tech Group Ltd. v. Optronic Sciences LLC*), and the parties are concurrently filing joint motions to terminate IPR2024-01130, -01131, -01132, and -01133.

Good cause exists to terminate this proceeding because the parties have settled their dispute regarding the '758 patent. Terminating the proceeding now would thus serve the interests of judicial economy as well as the mutual interest of the parties.

True and correct copies of the parties' settlement agreements are being concurrently filed as Confidential Exhibit 2013 with a joint motion to file settlement agreement as business confidential information and to keep it separate. There are no other agreements, oral or written, between the parties made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the dismissal of this proceeding.

Date: March 31, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/ Jefferson Cummings/

Jefferson Cummings (Reg. No.
81,926)
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT

Motion to Terminate — IPR2025-01245 — Patent No. 9,250,758

12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 826-7474

Attorney for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)(1))

The undersigned hereby certifies that the above document was served on March 31, 2026, by filing this document through the Patent Trial and Appeal Board End to End system as well as delivering a copy via electronic mail upon the following attorneys of record for the Petitioner:

Richard F. Martinelli
RFMPTABDocket@orrick.com
Tyler S. Miller
PTABDocketT5X@orrick.com

Date: March 31, 2026

/Jefferson Cummings/
Jefferson Cummings (Reg. No.
81,926)
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT
12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(310) 826-7474

Attorney for Patent Owner