

Pillsbury Wi...

News, cases, companies, fi Try our [Advanced Search](#) for more refined results

News, cases, companies, fi

 Toggle Dropdown

- [Search Law360](#)
- [Search News Only](#)
- [Search Cases Only](#)
- [Search PTAB Only](#)
- [Search TTAB Only](#)
- [Advanced Search](#)

[Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pit...](#)

- [My Account](#)
- [Emails & Alerts](#)
- [Newsletter Signup](#)

[Close](#)

- [Law360](#)
- [Law360 UK](#)
- [Law360 Pulse](#)
- [Law360 Employment Authority](#)
- [Law360 Tax Authority](#)
- [Law360 Insurance Authority](#)
- [Law360 Real Estate Authority](#)
- [Law360 Healthcare Authority](#)
- [Law360 Bankruptcy Authority](#)
- [Products](#)
- [Lexis®](#)
- [Law360 In-Depth](#)
- [Law360 Podcasts](#)
- [Rankings](#)
- [Leaderboard Analytics](#)
- [Regional Powerhouses](#)
- [Law360's MVPs](#)
- [Women in Law Report](#)
- [Law360 400](#)

- [Diversity Snapshot](#)
- [Practice Groups of the Year](#)
- [Rising Stars](#)
- [Titans of the Plaintiffs Bar](#)

- [Sections](#)
- [Adv. Search & Platform Tools](#)
- **[About all sections](#)**
- **[Browse all sections](#)**
- [Banking](#)
- [Bankruptcy](#)
- [Class Action](#)
- [Competition](#)
- [Employment](#)
- [Energy](#)
- [Expert Analysis](#)
- [Insurance](#)
- [Intellectual Property](#)
- [Product Liability](#)
- [Securities](#)

- [Beta Tools](#)
- [Track docs](#)
- [Track attorneys](#)
- [Track judges](#)

- [Site Menu](#)
- [Join the Law360 team](#)
- [Search legal jobs](#)
- [Learn more about Law360](#)
- [Read testimonials](#)
- [Contact Law360](#)
- [Sign up for our newsletters](#)
- [Law360 Company](#)
- [About Law360 Authority](#)
- [Resource Library](#)
- [Site Map](#)
- [Help](#)

[Intellectual Property](#) [Securities](#) [Bankruptcy](#) [Competition](#) [Employment](#) [White Collar](#) [Legal Industry](#) [Access To Justice](#) [Law360 UK](#) [Pulse](#) || [See all sections](#) || [NEWSLETTERS](#)

How realistic are your billable-hour targets?

[Click here to take the Law360 survey](#)

Squires' First Orders Reject PTAB Petitions

En Masse

By [Dani Kass](#) · [Listen to article](#)

Law360 (November 3, 2025, 9:46 PM EST) -- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Director John Squires, true to his word, rejected 13 petitions for inter partes review with no explanation, furthering the administration's controversial push toward narrowing the [Patent Trial and Appeal Board's](#) place in patent litigation.

Thumbs Down

Squires' stance comes after Deputy USPTO Director Coke Morgan Stewart, while serving as acting director, had taken the unheard of step of reviewing PTAB petitions herself to see if they should be denied for discretionary reasons.

She introduced new factors to see whether a petition should be cleared, including whether the patent had been in force for long enough to give the owner settled expectations that it wouldn't be challenged.

While patent owners [celebrated](#) her, petitioners were frustrated that, among other things, her orders were a few pages long, with only a few sentences dedicated to her analysis.

But Squires went further when the USPTO announced Wednesday that his decisions — [reviewing discretion and merits](#) — would be decided with a "summary notice," or "a proverbial 'thumbs-up' or 'thumbs-down,'" as PTAB Vice Chief Judge Michael Kim said in a webinar.

That's exactly what happened in Squires' [first batch of reviews](#) Friday, where he issued a bulk order rejecting 13 IPR petitions with only a brief statement:

"Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), institution of inter partes review is denied" in 13 IPR proceedings. "Accordingly, it is: ordered that the petitions are denied, and no trial is instituted."

Those challenges include three targeting [Nokia Technologies OY](#) video coding patents, requested by [Snap Inc.](#), [Hisense USA Corp.](#) and [ASUSTeK Computer Inc.](#)

Baby Jogger then dodged two challenges from Monahan Products LLC and Baby Generation Inc. — operating respectively as UPPAbaby and Mockingbird — to its stroller patents.

Birchtech Corp. beat two challenges from Union Electric Co. to mercury removal patents; [Corning Inc.](#) fended off Caihong Display Devices Co. Ltd.'s challenge to a glass manufacturing patent; and [Actelion Pharmaceuticals Ltd.](#) avoided an IPR requested by [United Therapeutics Corp.](#) over inventions ultimately tied to treating conditions like erectile dysfunction and hypertension.

[Amazon.com Services LLC](#) lost its attempt to challenge two VB Assets LLC patents directed to making purchases through voice commands and language processing; [Apple Inc.](#) failed its challenge to Advanced Coding Technologies LLC's communications quality patent; and [AT&T Services Inc.](#) was unable to persuade the PTAB to review [USTA Technology LLC](#)'s patent addressing radio communication interference.

The director likewise issued five rejections to rehearing requests without further comment.

[Advanced Micro Devices Inc.](#) and [Intel Corp.](#) each [lost](#) requests to [revive](#) IPR petitions aimed at the same

Advanced Cluster Systems Inc. cluster computing patent, which deputy director Stewart had rejected when she was handling reviews.

He also left in place Stewart's denials of Nvidia Corp. petitions challenging Neural AI LLC patents; Cisco Systems Inc.'s petitions challenging QPrivacy USA LLC patents; and Biofrontera Inc.'s challenge to a Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Inc. patent.

Uniqueness

These decisions could mirror what PTAB parties face often at the Federal Circuit: Rule 36 affirmances. There, the panel affirms a decision without any comment.

Or, as Covington & Burling LLP partner Scott Weidenfeller saw it, the decisions could mirror a U.S. Supreme Court order list.

"It's a single document that covers multiple proceedings, as opposed to a Rule 36 which is at least its own judgment in a particular proceeding," the former PTAB vice chief administrative patent judge said.

Lowenstein & Weatherwax LLP managing partner Ken Weatherwax said unexplained decisions are prevalent through other areas of law, and particularly in administrative law.

"There's been decades of ruling on adjudications in non-patent contexts," Weatherwax said. "I can't say the decisions seem to strike me as coherent, but courts have a tendency to give agencies a wide berth here."

Whether that remains true after the 2024 fall of Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council Inc. — the U.S. Supreme Court precedent giving agencies deference in certain interpretations — remains to be seen. He continued, "Would it extend or not to these sorts of questions of how much they have to explain themselves, especially when the decision is supposed to be usually unreviewable by the courts?"

Weidenfeller said he would expect to see Administrative Procedure Act challenges, in addition to outstanding or additional mandamus petitions, claiming it's a "pretty dramatic change to the landscape."

"[The changes] may have been easier to do without this long [practice] with longer decisions that convey information that the parties have started relying on and come to expect," he said.

Fleshed-Out Orders

Squires' flurry of decisions Friday featured two with explanations, one referring an initially rejected petition to the board and the other rejecting an initially referred petition.

Stewart had rejected Entegris Inc.'s challenge to an Inpria Corp. patent in July, saying Entegris had a relationship with a company facing Inpria in district court litigation. But Squires said the end of that litigation adjusted the playing field enough to justify sending the petition to the board.

Entegris was not a party in the district court litigation, so when the alleged infringer settled, there was no longer any parallel litigation, he said. The patent was also issued in 2023, which means it's too new for Inpria to have settled expectations, he added.

The director then let Bootler LLC escape a pair of IPRs pursued by Google LLC. Bootler had not initially requested a discretionary denial, so the petition against it was referred directly to the PTAB.

However, the patent owner sought discretionary denial after an Illinois federal judge found the data patents invalid as abstract under Section 101 of the Patent Act.

"Because the challenged claims have already been found to be invalid, it is not an efficient use of board resources to review them for patentability under other grounds," Squires said.

--Editing by Michael Watanabe.

For a reprint of this article, please contact reprints@law360.com.

0 Comments

Sign In To Comment

Attached Documents

- [Bulk Institution Decision](#)
- [AMD Rehearing Decision](#)
- [Biofrontera Rehearing Decision](#)
- [Cisco Rehearing Decision](#)
- [Entegris Rehearing Decision](#)
- [Google Institution Decision](#)
- [Intel Rehearing Decision](#)
- [NVIDIA Rehearing Decision](#)

Useful Tools & Links

- [Add to Briefcase](#)
- [Save to PDF & Print](#)
- [Rights/Reprints](#)
- [Editorial Contacts](#)

Related Sections

- [Energy](#)
- [Illinois](#)
- [Intellectual Property](#)
- [Life Sciences](#)
- [Public Policy](#)
- [Retail & E-Commerce](#)
- [Technology](#)
- [Telecommunications](#)

PTAB Case Information

Case Title

[Entegris, Inc. Inter Partes Review](#)

Case Number

IPR2025-00267

Date Filed

December 12, 2024

Case Title

Biofrontera Incorporated et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00287

Date Filed

December 27, 2024

Case Title

NVIDIA Corporation Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00606

Date Filed

February 24, 2025

Case Title

NVIDIA Corporation Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00608

Date Filed

March 06, 2025

Case Title

Intel Corporation Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00795

Date Filed

March 28, 2025

Case Title

Intel Corporation Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00794

Date Filed

March 28, 2025

Case Title

Cisco Systems, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00836

Date Filed

April 10, 2025

Case Title

Cisco Systems, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00837

Date Filed

April 10, 2025

Case Title

Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00863

Date Filed

April 16, 2025

Case Title

Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00862

Date Filed

April 16, 2025

Case Title

NVIDIA Corporation Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00610

Date Filed

April 30, 2025

Case Title

NVIDIA Corporation Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00609

Date Filed

April 30, 2025

Case Title

Google LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00967

Date Filed

May 06, 2025

Case Title

Google LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-00968

Date Filed

May 07, 2025

Case Title

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01117

Date Filed

June 06, 2025

Case Title

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01118

Date Filed

June 06, 2025

Case Title

United Therapeutics Corporation Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01139

Date Filed

June 10, 2025

Case Title

Caihong Display Devices Co., Ltd. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01137

Date Filed

June 11, 2025

Case Title

AT&T Services, Inc. et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01166

Date Filed

June 16, 2025

Case Title

Snap, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01114

Date Filed

June 16, 2025

Case Title

Amazon.com, Services LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01167

Date Filed

June 16, 2025

Case Title

ASUSTeK Computer Inc. et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01154

Date Filed

June 17, 2025

Case Title

Monahan Products, LLC (dba UPPAbaby) et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01105

Date Filed

June 20, 2025

Case Title

Monahan Products, LLC (dba UPPAbaby) et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01106

Date Filed

June 20, 2025

Case Title

Snap Inc. et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01014

Date Filed

June 23, 2025

Case Title

Apple Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01221

Date Filed

June 30, 2025

Case Title

Amazon.com Services LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01240

Date Filed

July 01, 2025

Law Firms

- Covington & Burling
- Lowenstein & Weatherwax

Companies

- Actelion Ltd.
- Advanced Micro Devices Inc.
- Amazon.com Inc.

- [Apple Inc.](#)
- [ASUSTeK Computer Inc.](#)
- [AT&T Inc.](#)
- [Biofrontera Inc.](#)
- [Chevron Corp.](#)
- [Cisco Systems Inc.](#)
- [Corning Inc.](#)
- [Entegris Inc.](#)
- [Google LLC](#)
- [Hisense Co. Ltd.](#)
- [Intel Corp.](#)
- [Natural Resources Defense Council](#)
- [Nokia Corp.](#)
- [NVIDIA Corp.](#)
- [Snap Inc.](#)
- [Sun Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.](#)
- [United States Tennis Association Inc.](#)
- [United Therapeutics Corp.](#)

Government Agencies

- [Patent Trial and Appeal Board](#)
- [U.S. Patent and Trademark Office](#)
- [U.S. Supreme Court](#)



[The 2025 Regional Powerhouses](#)

Law360's annual list of regional powerhouses reflects not only the work of exemplary firms, but also emerging legal trends in each state, from matters involving Colorado's growing life sciences industry, to an

uptick in bankruptcies in Delaware, to the continued flurry of intellectual property litigation in California.

Top 10 trending in Intellectual Property

- [1Industry Groups Want Trump Admin To Stop PTAB Changes](#)
- [2New IPR Rules Will Require A Patent Litigation Strategy Shift](#)
- [3Squires Sets Precedent On Making AI Patent-Eligible](#)
- [4Fed. Circ. Backs Samsung PTAB Victory Over Noise Control IP](#)
- [5Hytera Faces \\$290.8M Restitution Award In Trade Secrets Case](#)
- [6Perplexity Asks Judge To Toss User AI Output Claim](#)
- [7German Co. Denies SiriusXM Was 'Lulled' Into Infringing IP](#)
- [8Boies Schiller Adds 2 Attys From Herrick Feinstein, Disney](#)
- [9Attys Beware: Generative AI Can Also Hallucinate Metadata](#)
- [10Spotify Lets Bots Stream Drake As Other Artists Pay, Suit Says](#)

© 2025, Portfolio Media, Inc. | [About](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Careers at Law360](#) | [Terms](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Cookie Settings](#) | [Processing Notice](#) | [Ad Choices](#) | [Help](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Resource Library](#) | [Law360 Company](#) | [Testimonials](#)

×

Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman users

[Click Here to Sign In](#)

×

Sign up for our Intellectual Property newsletter

You must correct or enter the following before you can sign up:

Please provide a professional email:

[Select more newsletters to receive for free](#)

Law360 takes your privacy seriously. Please see our [Privacy Policy](#).

[No Thanks](#) [Sign up now](#)

Thank You!