



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE  
FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

TOP GLORY TRADING GROUP INC. and  
DP DREAM PAIRS INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

COLE HAAN LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2025-01395  
Patent D768,959 S

---

Before JOHN A. SQUIRES, *Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual  
Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

DECISION  
Denying Patent Owner's Request for Discretionary Denial

Cole Haan LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a request for discretionary denial (Paper 10, “DD Req.”) in the above-captioned case, and Top Glory Trading Group Inc. and DP Dream Pairs Inc. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed an opposition (Paper 15, “DD Opp.”).

After considering the parties’ arguments and the record, and in view of all relevant considerations, discretionary denial of institution was not appropriate in this proceeding. *See* Paper 17 (“Notice of Decisions on Institution” or “Notice”), 2. This determination was based on the totality of the evidence and arguments the parties presented, only a select portion of which is discussed in the following opinion identified as forthcoming in the Notice. *See id.*

Petitioner argues that “a significant change in law” has occurred since the patent issued, which counsels against discretionary denial. DD Opp. 3 (citing *Intel Corp. v. Proxense, LLC*, IPR2025- 00327, Paper 12, 2–3 (Director June 26, 2025)). In particular, Petitioner contends that the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit “fundamentally changed the obviousness standard for design patents” in *LKQ Corp. v. GM Global Tech. Operations LLC*, 102 F.4th 1280, 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2024), which impacts the validity of the challenged patent. *Id.* at 2. Petitioner’s argument is persuasive. The challenged patent was examined and issued under an obviousness standard for design patents that the Federal Circuit has since abrogated, and it is an appropriate use of Office resources to consider the merits of Petitioner’s challenge despite any settled expectations Patent Owner may have. *See* DD Opp. 3–4.

While certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination not to exercise discretion to deny institution is based on the complete record and

a holistic assessment of all of the evidence in light of the arguments presented.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner's request for discretionary denial is *denied*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that neither party shall file a request for rehearing or Director Review of this decision until a Notice of Decision on Institution including this case issues.

IPR2025-01395  
Patent D768,959 S

FOR PETITIONER:

James Davis  
Matthew Shapiro  
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP  
jdavis@sheppardmullin.com  
mshapiro@sheppardmullin.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Chad Walters  
Lindsay Volpenhein Cutie  
Amy Bergeron  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
chad.walters@bakerbotts.com  
lindsay.cutie@bakerbotts.com  
amy.bergeron@bakerbotts.com  
dltopgloryvcolehaaniprs@BakerBotts.com