

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

IGT  
Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-01855  
Patent No. 6,913,532

---

**JOINT MOTION TO TERMINATE PURSUANT TO  
35 U.S.C. § 317 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.74**

---

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317, 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.72 and 42.74, and the Board's authorization of October 3, 2016, Petitioner Aristocrat Technologies, Inc. and Patent Owner IGT jointly move to terminate the present *inter partes* review proceeding in light of the parties' settlement of their dispute insofar as it relates to U.S. Patent No. 6,913,532 ("the '532 patent"). The parties are filing, concurrently herewith, a true and complete copy of their written Settlement Agreement dated September 29, 2016, including Exhibits A-F thereto ("Settlement Agreement") (Confidential Exhibit 1026) in connection with this matter as required by the statute. The Settlement Agreement completely settles the parties' controversy and their dispute relating to the '532 patent as between Patent Owner and Aristocrat Technologies, Inc., the Petitioner and real party-in-interest in the present proceeding, who was named as a Defendant in the U.S. district court litigation captioned *IGT v. Aristocrat Technologies, Inc.*, Case No. 2:15-cv-00473-GMN-GWF (United States District Court for the District of Nevada).

The parties further jointly certify that there are no other agreements or understandings, oral or written, between Patent Owner and Petitioner, including any other collateral agreements, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of the present proceeding as set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 317(b), other than the Settlement Agreement, including Exhibits A-F thereto.

The parties request that the Settlement Agreement (Confidential Exhibit 1026) be treated as business confidential information and kept separate from the file of the '532 patent. A joint request to treat the Settlement Agreement, including Exhibits A-F thereto, as business confidential information kept separate from the file of the involved patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317(b) is being filed concurrently herewith.

Termination with Respect to Inter Partes Review Proceeding

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 No. 26, at \*2 (P.T.A.B. July 28, 2014). Each element is addressed below:

As for requirement (1), termination is appropriate in this proceeding because the parties have settled their dispute with respect to the '532 patent, and have agreed to terminate this *inter partes* review. The applicable statute, 35 U.S.C. § 317(a), provides that an *inter partes* review proceeding “shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the

request for termination is filed.” In this case, the *inter partes* review is not at a stage in which the Office would have a complete enough record on which to make a decision on the merits. The Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response has not been filed and the Board has not determined whether to institute trial. Moreover, as recognized by the rules of practice before the Board:

There are strong public policy reasons to favor settlement between the parties to a proceeding. The Board will be available to facilitate settlement discussions, and where appropriate, may require a settlement discussion as part of the proceeding. 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.

Patent Office Trial Practice Guide, Fed. Register, Vol. 77, No. 157 at 48768 (Aug. 14, 2012). Moreover, no public interest or other factors militate against termination of this proceeding.

As for requirements (2) and (4), the table below identifies parties in district court litigations involving the ’532 patent, and discusses the current status of these related litigations with respect to each party to the litigation. *See Heartland Tanning, Inc.*, Paper No. 26, at \*2.

<b>Case Caption</b>	<b>Parties</b>	<b>Current Status of Each Related Litigation With Respect to Each Party to the Litigation or Proceeding</b>
<i>IGT v. Aristocrat Technologies, Inc.</i> , Case No. 2:15-cv-00473-GMN-GWF (United States District Court for the District of Nevada)	IGT, Aristocrat Technologies, Inc., Aristocrat Technologies Australia Pty Ltd, Aristocrat International Pty Ltd.	The parties will be filing a Stipulation and Order of Dismissal.

As for requirements (3) and (4), no other related *Inter Partes* Review proceedings for the '532 patent are currently before the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office.

Finally, as discussed above, the Settlement Agreement fully resolves all litigation and proceedings between the parties to this IPR proceeding relating to the '532 patent. The parties will be filing a Stipulation and Order of Dismissal in the district court litigation involving Petitioner Aristocrat Technologies, Inc. pursuant to Paragraph 2 of the Settlement Agreement.

For the foregoing reasons, the parties jointly and respectfully request that the instant proceeding be terminated.

Date: October 7, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrea G. Reister

Registration No.: 36,253

Jay I. Alexander

Registration No.: 32,678

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One CityCenter, 850 Tenth Street, NW

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 662-6000

Attorneys for Petitioner

By /Michelle K. Holoubek/

Robert Greene Sterne

Registration No.: 28,912

Michelle K. Holoubek

Registration No.: 54,179

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN  
& FOX P.L.L.C.

1100 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 371-2600


Attorneys for Patent Owner

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6, I hereby certify that on this 7th day of October 2016, the foregoing Joint Motion to Terminate Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 317 and 37 C.F.R. § 42.74, was served via email by agreement of the parties on the following counsel of record for Patent Owner:

Robert Greene Sterne (rsterne-PTAB@skgf.com)  
Michelle K. Holoubek (mholoubek-PTAB@skgf.com)  
PTAB@skgf.com  
Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox PLLC

Date: October 7, 2016

  
Andrea G. Reister  
Registration No.: 36,253