

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 is AI changing the way you work?
[Click here to take the Law360 survey](#)

Squires Issues 21 More Patent Review

Denials

By [Ryan Davis](#) · [Listen to article](#)

Law360 (December 19, 2025, 6:41 PM EST) -- [U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Director John Squires](#) has denied 21 requests for America Invents Act patent reviews, while not agreeing to institute any new proceedings.

In Squires' latest round of summary decisions Thursday, he issued a [short order](#) saying that all 21 inter partes review denials were for discretionary reasons, with no denials based on the merits of the challenger's invalidity arguments.

BY THE NUMBERS

Squires' Decisions Since October

13

Petitions granted

134

Petitions denied

8.8%

Institution rate

The director also said after considering discretionary issues in 18 additional cases, he would move on to considering the merits and issue decisions later.

As is typical, the order mostly consisted of a list of case numbers, with no details on the rationale for the decisions. However, Squires issued a separate decision in one case explaining why he decided not to issue a discretionary denial.

Since he began making all institution decisions himself [in October](#), Squires has now instituted review in a total of 13 cases and denied review in 134, for an institution rate of 8.8%. Of the denials, 131 have been for

discretionary reasons, which can include the age of the patent or the status of related infringement litigation, with the three others based on the merits.

Institution decisions were previously made by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, which instituted review in around 70% of cases in recent years. The board now only conducts AIA reviews and issues final decisions if Squires institutes review.

The cases for which Squires denied review Thursday include challenges by Google LLC to numerous Telecom Ventures LLC patents, three petitions by SK Hynix challenging Advanced Memory Technologies LLC patents, along with petitions by companies including Meta Platforms Inc., FedEx Corp. and BOE Technology Group Co. Ltd.

Squires issued a separate order detailing why he did not discretionarily deny a petition by Caption Health Inc. challenging a University of British Columbia patent on analyzing ultrasound images and would instead consider the merits.

The university argued that the petition should be denied because Caption Health had taken inconsistent positions at the board and in infringement litigation in the Northern District of California on how the claims of the patent should be construed.

Caption Health responded that it was seeking to use the same plain and ordinary meaning in both proceedings and only provided more elaboration in the district court case. However, it agreed to use the same expressly stated claim construction from court at the board to "remove any perceived discrepancy."

Squires said under a November decision he has made precedential, petitioners must explain inconsistent positions taken at the board and in court.

He said in Thursday's order that "while it is not entirely clear whether [Caption Health] sought to advance an inconsistent claim construction position," he would take the company's argument as a stipulation that it would now use the same claim construction in both proceedings.

"Petitioner's stipulation, therefore, resolves any potential inconsistency in claim construction positions between forums," he said, concluding that "discretionary denial of institution is not appropriate in this proceeding."

The other cases the director said he will now be reviewing on the merits include petitions filed by Apple Inc., Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd., Cisco Systems Inc., Snap Inc. and Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co. Ltd.

Squires has now issued six bulk rulings on institution decisions. In the first three orders, he denied all 91 petitions he considered. That was followed by one order in which he instituted six reviews and denied 10 petitions, one where he instituted seven reviews and denied 12, and Thursday's order denying 21 petitions.

--Editing by Rich Mills.

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

0 Comments

Sign In To Comment

Attached Documents

- [Order](#)
- [Caption Health Order](#)

Useful Tools & Links

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

Related Sections

- [California](#)
- [Health](#)
- [Intellectual Property](#)
- [Public Policy](#)
- [Technology](#)

PTAB Case Information

Case Title

[Google LLC Inter Partes Review](#)

Case Number

[IPR2025-01349](#)

Date Filed

July 25, 2025

Case Title

[Google LLC Inter Partes Review](#)

Case Number

[IPR2025-01389](#)

Date Filed

August 06, 2025

Case Title

Google LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01401

Date Filed

August 08, 2025

Case Title

Google LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01408

Date Filed

August 11, 2025

Case Title

Google LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01409

Date Filed

August 12, 2025

Case Title

Google LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01419

Date Filed

August 13, 2025

Case Title

Netskope, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01115

Date Filed

August 13, 2025

Case Title

Google LLC Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01421

Date Filed

August 14, 2025

Case Title

BOE Technology Group Co., Ltd. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01396

Date Filed

August 14, 2025

Case Title

Excelliance Mos Corporation Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01433

Date Filed

August 15, 2025

Case Title

Tempus AI, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01434

Date Filed

August 15, 2025

Case Title

Tempus AI, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01435

Date Filed

August 15, 2025

Case Title

Voltage, LLC et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01443

Date Filed

August 19, 2025

Case Title

Meta Platforms, Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01334

Date Filed

August 19, 2025

Case Title

Topsoe, Inc. et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01455

Date Filed

August 22, 2025

Case Title

Canadian Solar (USA) Inc. et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01432

Date Filed

August 22, 2025

Case Title

SK hynix Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01449

Date Filed

August 22, 2025

Case Title

SK hynix Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01453

Date Filed

August 25, 2025

Case Title

SK hynix Inc. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01451

Date Filed

August 27, 2025

Case Title

FedEx Corporation et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01491

Date Filed

August 29, 2025

Case Title

FedEx Corporation et al. Inter Partes Review

Case Number

IPR2025-01490

Date Filed

August 29, 2025

Companies

- Apple Inc.
- BOE Technology Group Co. Ltd.
- Cisco Systems Inc.
- FedEx Corp.
- Google LLC
- Meta Platforms Inc.
- Samsung Electronics Co. Ltd.
- SK Hynix Inc.
- Snap Inc.
- Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co. Ltd.
- University of British Columbia

Government Agencies

- Patent Trial and Appeal Board
- U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California
- U.S. Patent and Trademark Office



Law360 MVP Awards Go To Top Attorneys From 76 Firms

The attorneys chosen as Law360's 2025 MVPs have distinguished themselves from their peers by securing significant achievements in high-stakes litigation, complex global matters and record-breaking deals.

Top 10 trending in Intellectual Property

- [1The Top Patent Damages Of 2025](#)
- [2Squires Issues 21 More Patent Review Denials](#)
- [3Top Trade Secrets Decisions Of 2025](#)
- [4Samsung Wants \\$191.4M Patent Verdict Axed Or Cut To \\$1.7M](#)
- [5Rakoff Asks If Man Seeking 'Top Gun' Credit Had Copyright](#)
- [6Ramey Must Seek Permission For Future WDTX Patent Suits](#)
- [7J&J, ChemImage Reach Deal After \\$77M AI Patent Judgment](#)
- [8In Reggaeton Case, Judge Asks If Beats Are Commonplace](#)
- [9Fed. Circ. Declines To Save MemoryWeb Digital File Patent](#)
- [10AstraZeneca Unit Ducks Patent Fraud, Not Sham Suit Claims](#)

© 2025, Portfolio Media, Inc. | [About](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Careers at Law360](#) | [Terms](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Trust Center](#) | [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!