

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

BOE TECHNOLOGY GROUP CO., LTD.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SAMSUNG DISPLAY CO., LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 10,439,015

---

*Inter Partes* Review No. IPR2025-01480

---

**JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PROCEEDING  
PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 317(A)**

**Petitioner’s Updated Exhibit List**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>
1001	U.S. Patent No. 10,439,015 (“’015 Patent” or “’015 Pat.”)
1002	File History of the ’015 Patent (“’015FH”)
1003	Declaration of Ronald S. Cok (“Cok”)
1004	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2014/0132584 A1 (“Kim-584”)
1005	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2012/0019504 A1 (“Han”)
1006	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2014/0034923 A1 (“Kim-923”)
1007	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2014/0042405 A1 (“Moon”)
1008	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2014/0098078 A1 (“Jeon-078”)
1009	RESERVED
1010	Japanese Pat. No. 3,858,572 (“Masao”)
1011	U.S. Patent No. 6,225,966 B1 (“Ohtani”)
1012	N. H. E. Weste et al., <i>CMOS VLSI Design: A Circuits and Systems Perspective</i> , Fourth Edition, Addison-Wesley, 2011 (“Weste”)
1013	U.S. Patent No. 5,136,358 (“Sakai”)
1014	U.S. Patent No. 5,285,017 (“Gardner”)
1015	U.S. Patent No. 6,510,545 (“Yee”)
1016	U.S. Patent No. 8,692,297 (“Ho”)
1017	U.S. Patent No. 6,622,294 (“Saxena”)
1018	U.S. Patent No. 8,670,099 (“Xie”)
1019	U.S. Patent No. 8,988,852 (“Signoff”)

1020	Chinese Patent Publication No. 113936600 (“Tian”)
1021	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2014/0320544 (“Kim-544”)
1022	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2014/0070184 (“Shin”)
1023	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0007535 (“Tang”)
1024	RESERVED
1025	Korean Patent Publication No. 20050052033 (“Kim-033”)
1026	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2011/0025585 (“Kim-585”)
1027	Korean Patent Publication No. 870000854 (“Hong”)
1028	U.S. Patent No. 8,487,311 (“Liu”)
1029	U.S. Patent No. 8,514,155 (“Kobayashi”)
1030	U.S. Patent No. 8,269,696 (“Tomida”)
1031	U.S. Patent No. 7,855,507 (“Kim-507”)
1032	U.S. Patent No. 8,653,521 (“Hwang”)
1033	U.S. Patent No. 8,701,068 (“McElvain”)
1034	Confidential Settlement Agreement

Petitioner BOE Technology Group Co., Ltd. (“BOE”) and Patent Owner Samsung Display Co. Ltd. (“Samsung”) have reached a settlement as to all the disputes in this proceeding. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74, BOE and Samsung jointly move to terminate the present *inter partes* review proceeding. The Board authorized the filing of this motion in their email dated November 20, 2025. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(c), and the Board’s authorization e-mail, a Joint Request that the Settlement Agreement Be Treated as Business Confidential Information is being filed concurrently, and the copy of the agreement (Ex. 1034) is being filed as Board and Parties Only.

## **I. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

Samsung Display Co. Ltd. filed a patent infringement lawsuit against BOE, alleging infringement of the ’015 patent. The lawsuit is captioned *Samsung Display Co. v. BOE Technology Group Co.*, No. 2:25-cv-00412-JRG (E.D. Tex.) and was before the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas. The parties have filed a stipulation to dismiss the district court action with prejudice.

BOE and Samsung have reached an agreement to resolve the Parties’ disputes at issue in this proceeding. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.74(b), the Parties’ Settlement Agreement is in writing, and a true and correct copy is being filed as

EX1034. BOE and Samsung certify that there are no collateral agreements or understandings made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of this IPR. There is no other litigation or proceeding involving the '015 patent between Petitioner and Patent Owner, and no litigation or proceeding between Petitioner and Patent Owner is contemplated in the foreseeable future in view of the Settlement Agreement.

## **II. RELIEF REQUESTED**

Termination of this *inter partes* review is respectfully requested, and the Parties submit that such termination is justified. “There are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding.” Consolidated Trial Practice Guide 86 (Nov. 2019). “The Board expects that a proceeding will terminate after the filing of a settlement agreement, unless the Board has already decided the merits of the proceeding.” *Id.* (citing 35 U.S.C. §§317(a)).

The Board should terminate this proceeding, as the Parties jointly request, for the following reasons:

*First*, BOE and Samsung have met the statutory requirement that they file a “joint request” to terminate before the Office “has decided the merits of the proceeding.” 35 U.S.C. § 317(a). Under section 317(a), an *inter partes* review shall be terminated upon such joint request “unless the Office has decided the

merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed.” There are no other preconditions of 35 U.S.C. § 317(a). At the time of this paper, the Board has not “decided the merits of the proceeding.”

*Second*, BOE and Samsung have reached a settlement as to all the disputes in this proceeding. A true copy of the Settlement Agreement is filed concurrently herewith as Board and Parties Only, along with a Joint Request that the Settlement Agreement Be Treated as Business Confidential Information. *See* Exhibit 1034. No other such agreements, written or oral, exist between or among the Parties relating to this proceeding. The Settlement Agreement thus satisfies the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 317(b).

*Third*, termination would save significant further expenditure of resources by the Parties. Termination as requested would also further the purpose of *inter partes* review proceedings to provide an efficient and less costly alternative forum for patent disputes. Further, maintaining the proceeding would discourage future settlements, as patent owners in similar situations would have a strong disincentive to settle if they perceived that an *inter partes* review would continue regardless of a settlement.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner and Patent Owner respectfully request termination of this *inter partes* review.

As agreed upon by the parties, Petitioner files this joint motion on behalf of the parties.

Dated: November 25, 2025

/ Jessica Kaiser /

Jessica Kaiser  
Reg. No. 58,937  
Kaiser-ptab@perkinscoie.com  
Perkins Coie LLP  
1900 Sixteenth Street, Ste. 1400  
Denver, CO 80202-5255

*Attorneys for Petitioners*

Respectfully submitted,

/ Scott C. Weidenfeller /

Scott C. Weidenfeller (Reg. No. 54,531)  
sweidenfeller@cov.com  
Covington & Burling LLP  
One CityCenter, 850 Tenth Street NW  
Washington, DC 20001

*Attorneys for Patent Owner*

IPR2025-01480  
Patent No. 10,439,015

**Certificate of Service (37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)(4))**

I hereby certify that the attached JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO 35 U.S.C. § 317(a) was served as of the below date via email (by agreement) to the following counsel of record for Patent Owner:

Scott C. Weidenfeller - sweidenfeller@cov.com  
David A. Garr - dgarr@cov.com  
SDC-BOE-IPR@cov.com

Dated: November 25, 2025

By / *Kate Rose* / \_\_\_\_\_  
Kate Rose  
Senior Paralegal