

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit**

---

**ST CASE1TECH, LLC,**  
*Appellant*

**v.**

**JOHN A. SQUIRES, UNDER SECRETARY OF  
COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE,**  
*Intervenor*

---

2023-2294

---

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark  
Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. IPR2022-  
00234.

---

Decided: October 9, 2025

---

TIMOTHY DEVLIN, Devlin Law Firm LLC, Wilmington,  
DE, for appellant. Also represented by ANDREW PETER  
DEMARCO, ROBERT J. GAJARSA, JASON MITCHELL SHAPIRO.

OMAR FAROOQ AMIN, Office of the Solicitor, United  
States Patent and Trademark Office, Alexandria, VA, for  
intervenor. Also represented by PETER J. AYERS, MAI-  
TRANG DUC DANG, ROBERT J. MCMANUS.

---

Before PROST, TARANTO, and STARK, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

This appeal is a companion to *ST Case1Tech, LLC v. Squires*, Nos. 23-2305 and 23-2306, decided today, in which we affirm the decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (Board) that claims 14–17 of U.S. Patent No. 8,111,839 are unpatentable for obviousness. In the present appeal, ST Case1Tech brings a materially identical challenge to the Board’s separate decision holding unpatentable claims 17–20 of U.S. Patent No. 9,124,982. *See Samsung Electronics Co. v. Staton Techiya, LLC*, IPR2022-00234 at 65–71 (P.T.A.B. June 14, 2023), J.A. 65–71. The parties’ briefs here present arguments not materially different from those presented in the companion case and cite no portions of the record materially different from the record materials cited in Nos. 23-2305 and 23-2306. Our reasoning in the decision in those two appeals thus applies with equal force here. Accordingly, we affirm the decision of the Board.

**AFFIRMED**