

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD. and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS
AMERICA, INC.,

Petitioners

v.

MOBILE DATA TECHNOLOGIES LLC,

Patent Owner

IPR2025-00536
U.S. Patent No. 9,032,039

**PATENT OWNER'S AUTHORIZED RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS'
REQUEST FOR DIRECTOR REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION1

II. The Decision Correctly Found PO’s Strong Settled Expectations.....2

 A. PO Has Strong Settled Expectations in the ‘039 Patent2

 B. Petitioners Have No Legitimate Settled Expectations7

III. This Decision Is Consistent with the Director’s Other Decisions.....9

IV. The Decision’s Factual Findings Regarding the Likely Time to Trial
and Likelihood of a Stay are Supported by the Record.....11

V. Discretionary Denial Does Not Violate the Due Process Clause or the
APA12

VI. CONCLUSION.....14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Anaheim Gardens, L.P. v. United States</i> , 953 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	4
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential)	13
<i>Cambridge Indus. v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00434, Paper 11 (June 26, 2025)	3
<i>Celgene Corp. v. Peter</i> , 931 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	7
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 579 U.S. 261 (2016)	1, 13
<i>Embody, Inc. v. Lifenet Health</i> , IPR2025-00248, Paper 13 (June 26, 2025)	3
<i>Ericsson Inc. v. Procomm Int’l Pte. Ltd.</i> , IPR2024-01453, Paper 15 (June 25, 2025)	2
<i>Google LLC v. Soundclear Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2025-00344, Paper 15 (Aug. 4, 2025)	2, 4
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	1
<i>Intel v. Proxense LLC</i> , IPR2025-00327, Paper 12 (June 26, 2025)	5, 8
<i>iRhythm Techs., Inc. v. Welch Allyn, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00363, Paper 10 (June 6, 2025)	2
<i>iRhythm Techs., Inc. v. Welch Allyn, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00363, Paper 11 (July 3, 2025)	13

<i>iRhythm Techs., Inc. v. Welch Allyn, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00363, Paper 13 (Aug. 5, 2025)	13
<i>Kahoot! AS v. Interstellar Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00696, Paper 12 (July 31, 2025)	4, 8
<i>Linkplay Technology Inc. et al. vs Sonos, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00509, Paper 10 (July 31, 2025)	11, 12
<i>Mylan Labs. Ltd. v. Janssen Pharma., N.V.</i> , 989 F.3d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2021)	13
<i>Nat'l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Canadian Pacific Ry., Ltd.</i> , 357 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	6
<i>Padagis US LLC v. Neurelis, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00464, Paper 12 (July 16, 2025)	10
<i>Prima Tek II, L.L.C. v. A-Roo Co.</i> , 222 F.3d 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	3
<i>SAP Am., Inc. v. Valtrus Innov. Ltd.</i> , IPR2025-00416, Paper 10 (July 10, 2025)	3
<i>SAP Am., Inc. v. Valtrus Innov. Ltd.</i> , IPR2025-00416, Paper 8 (June 9, 2025).....	3
<i>Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd. v. Stratasys, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00438, Paper 10 (July 17, 2025)	4, 8, 9
<i>Tesla, Inc. v. Intell. Ventures II</i> , IPR2025-00217, Paper 9 (June 13, 2025).....	5, 10
<i>Tesla, Inc. v. Navy</i> , IPR2025-00341, Paper 12 (June 13, 2025).....	5
<i>TQ Delta, LLC v. DISH Network LLC</i> , 929 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2019)	13
<i>Vital Connect, Inc. v. Bardy Diagnostics, Inc.</i> , IPR2023-00381, Paper 7 (July 11, 2023)	7

Wilson v. Rousseau,
45 U.S. 646 (1846).....3

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 314..... 1, 7, 13

EXHIBIT LIST

Ex.	Description
2001	E-mail serving amended infringement contentions in EDTX-Litigation
2002	Comparison between the specifications of the '039 and '801 Patents
2003	Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review in IPR2025-00536 (Jan. 31, 2025)
2004	Reserved
2005	Reserved
2006	E-mail from the Board regarding the 535 and 536 IPR panel assignments (May 2, 2025)
2007	Reserved
2008	E-mail from Erick S. Robinson memorializing the phone conversation with Petitioners' counsel (September 26, 2024)
2009	Reserved
2010	Reserved
2011	Reserved
2012	Reserved
2013	E-mail exchange between Erick S. Robinson and Petitioners' counsel regarding a stay (October 17, 2024)
2014	E-mail exchange between Erick S. Robinson and Petitioners' counsel regarding a stay (February 19, 2025)
2015	E-mail exchange between Erick S. Robinson and Petitioners' counsel wherein Petitioners shared their motion to stay with Patent Owner (March 4, 2025)
2016	Second Amended Docket Control Order in the EDTX-Litigation (December 19, 2024)
2017	United States District Courts — National Judicial Caseload Profile (September 30, 2024)
2018	E-mail from Petitioners' counsel serving their initial and additional disclosures (October 16, 2024)
2019	E-mail from Petitioners' counsel serving their invalidity contentions (January 31, 2025)
2020	E-mail from Petitioners providing materials produced by third-party Microsoft Corporation and Sybase, Inc. in response to Petitioners' subpoena in the EDTX-Litigation (April 25, 2025)
2021	E-mail from Petitioners providing materials produced by third-party Casio America, Inc. in response to Petitioners' subpoena in the EDTX-Litigation (March 7, 2025)

Ex.	Description
2022	E-mail from Petitioners providing materials produced by third-party Sony Electronics, Inc. in response to Petitioners' subpoena in the EDTX-Litigation (February 24, 2025)
2023	E-mail from Petitioners providing materials produced by third-party Casio America, Inc. in response to Petitioners' subpoena in the EDTX-Litigation (February 21, 2025)
2024	E-mail from Petitioners providing materials produced by third-party Sony Electronics, Inc. in response to Petitioners' subpoena in the EDTX-Litigation (February 11, 2025)
2025	E-mail from Petitioners providing materials produced by third-party AT&T Mobility LLC in response to Petitioners' subpoena in the EDTX-Litigation (February 5, 2025)
2026	Patent Owner's Infringement Contentions in the EDTX-Litigation (September 4, 2024)
2027	Petitioners' Invalidity Contentions in the EDTX-Litigation (January 31, 2025)
2028	E-mail exchange between Homayoon Rafatijo and Petitioners' counsel regarding Petitioners' contacting the Board for filing their proposed <i>Sotera</i> stipulation (April 21-23, 2025)
2029	E-mail from Petitioners' counsel with a draft of a proposed communication to the Board (April 30, 2025)
2030	E-mail from Petitioners' counsel with sharing with Patent Owner their proposed <i>Sotera</i> stipulation (April 18, 2025)
2031	Reserved
2032	Petitioners' proposed <i>Sotera</i> stipulation for '535 and '536 IPRs (April 18, 2025)
2033	Petitioners' claim chart against '039 Patent based on the Nokia 9210 System (January 31, 2025)
2034	Reserved
2035	Summary of verbatim (or nearly verbatim, strikethrough added) matches between the '536 petition to the Houh Declaration (Ex.1003)
2036	E-Mail from Petitioners providing Casio America, Inc.'s declarations certifying business records in response to Petitioners' subpoena in the EDTX-Litigation (May 9, 2025)
2037	Joel West & David Wood, <i>EVOLVING AN OPEN ECOSYSTEM: THE RISE AND FALL OF THE SYMBIAN PLATFORM</i> (2013)
2038	Bradston Henry, <i>Multiplayer Server Basics Creating a Multiplayer Game Server - Part 1</i> (Oct. 25, 2021),

Ex.	Description
	https://dev.to/ibmdeveloper/multiplayer-server-basics-ep-1-creating-a-multiplayer-game-server-5aed
2039	Declaration of George Edwards in Regard to the Petitions for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent No. 9,032,039
2040	Petitioner's Authorized Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (IPR2021-00917, Paper 7, Sept. 22, 2021)
2041	Declaration of Mahdi Eslamimehr for IPR2025-00536 of U.S. Patent No. 9,032,039
2042	File History of Ex Parte Reexamination of U.S. Patent 8,793,336

I. INTRODUCTION

A decision to deny institution of an IPR “is a matter committed to the Patent Office’s *discretion*.” *Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, 579 U.S. 261, 273 (2016) (citing 35 U.S.C. § 314(a)); *see also Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech., Inc.*, 815 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“PTO is permitted, but never compelled, to institute an IPR”). And Petitioners have failed to show that the Director’s delegate improperly discretionarily denied institution of this case (Paper 13, “Decision”).

As a threshold matter, Petitioners copied their arguments from the 535 IPR and pasted them into their Request for this IPR without tailoring them to the issues presented here, including the merits. This approach underscores the insufficiency of their Request. Even considering these arguments, however, Petitioners’ Request fails. First, Petitioners have failed to show that the Decision’s “strong settled expectations” finding was in error. Second, the Decision is consistent with other Board decisions. Third, the Decision’s factual findings regarding the likely time to trial and likelihood of a stay are not erroneous and are supported by the record. And fourth, the Decision does not violate the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment or the Administrative Procedures Act (“APA”). Thus, the Decision should stand.

II. The Decision Correctly Found PO's Strong Settled Expectations

A. PO Has Strong Settled Expectations in the '039 Patent

The Decision correctly found that the PO has “strong settled expectations” in the '039 Patent, which issued in 2015. Decision, 2. There can be no dispute that Petitioners had knowledge of the Asserted Patents family since at least May 2015: U.S. Patent 8,135,801 (“5801 Patent”) was brought to Petitioners’ attention by the Examiner during the prosecution of Petitioner’ U.S. Design Patent 753,156. *See, e.g.*, IPR2025-00537, Paper 13, 1. In *iRhythm*, “settled expectations favor[ed] denial of institution” where petitioner knew of a family patent but delayed seeking review. *iRhythm Techs., Inc. v. Welch Allyn, Inc.*, IPR2025-00363, Paper 10, 3 (June 6, 2025). *See also Ericsson Inc. v. Procomm Int’l Pte. Ltd.*, IPR2024-01453, Paper 15, 3 (June 25, 2025) (applying *iRhythm* where the challenged patent was “brought to Petitioner’s attention” by Examiner); *Google LLC v. Soundclear Techs. LLC*, IPR2025-00344, Paper 15, 2-3 (Aug. 4, 2025) (“[C]onsidering that Petitioner had knowledge of the challenged patents as early as 2019 ... Patent Owner’s strong settled expectations tip the balance in favor of discretionary denial.”).

Petitioners’ arguments regarding settled expectations fail. **First**, although the '039 Patent issued in 2015, Petitioners claim that PO has no settled expectations because “PO acquired the patent in April 2022.” Req. 3-4. Petitioners’ argument is legally incorrect: as PO previously explained, an assignee is deemed the effective

patentee. “[T]he assignee stands in the shoes or in the place of the patentee, and represents him.” *Wilson v. Rousseau*, 45 U.S. 646, 703 (1846); *see also Prima Tek II, L.L.C. v. A-Roo Co.*, 222 F.3d 1372, 1377 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“[W]here the patentee makes an assignment of all substantial rights under the patent, the assignee may be deemed the effective ‘patentee.’”).

Petitioners offer no support for their argument that a patent owner who recently acquired the patent does not have settled expectations. To the contrary, in *SAP Am., Inc.*, the Director held that a PO has “strong settled expectations” despite PO having “acquire[d] the challenged patent [in] 2021.” *SAP Am., Inc. v. Valtrus Innov. Ltd.*, IPR2025-00416, Paper 10 (July 10, 2025), Paper 8, 20 (June 9, 2025).

Petitioners’ reliance on *Embody* and *Cambridge* is also misplaced. In those cases, unlike here, the challenged patents issued only a few years prior to IPR filing. Req. 3-4; *Embody, Inc. v. Lifenet Health*, IPR2025-00248, Paper 13, 2-3 (June 26, 2025) (one patent “has been in force” for 3 years and the other patent is a parent of the first); *Cambridge Indus. v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc.*, IPR2025-00434, Paper 11, 2-3 (June 26, 2025) (most of patents were in force for five to six years). Indeed, *Cambridge* actually supports the Decision because in *Cambridge* the Director granted discretionary denial on patents that had been in force for more than six years, like the ‘039 Patent. *Cambridge*, IPR2025-00434, Paper 11, 3.

Second, Petitioners’ argument that “what matters are PO’s expectations for its 2022 investment, not the prior owner’s expectations between 2015 and the sale” (Req. 4) is unsupported. *Anaheim Gardens*, relied upon by Petitioners, is unavailing at least because it is not a patent case; it addresses regulatory taking under the Fifth Amendment’s “just compensation” clause. *Anaheim Gardens, L.P. v. United States*, 953 F.3d 1344, 1349-50 (Fed. Cir. 2020). Petitioners cite no authority that supports the application of the concept of “investment expectations” in the IPR context.

Third, Petitioners’ assertion that the ‘039 Patent was not “in force in any meaningful way before 2022” because the “prior owner never tried to exclude anyone from practicing the patent” is also without merit Req. 4. The Director has previously rejected this very argument: “Petitioner’s argument that Patent Owner does not have settled expectations because Patent Owner did not previously assert the challenged patent against Petitioner does not defeat Patent Owner’s settled expectations.” *Kahoot! AS v. Interstellar Inc.*, IPR2025-00696, Paper 12, 2 (July 31, 2025); *see also Google LLC*, IPR2025-00344, Paper 15, 2-3 (substantively the same).

Petitioners’ reliance on *Shenzhen* and *Intel* (Req. 4-5) is also misplaced. In *Shenzhen*, the petitioners “never ‘commercialized, asserted, marked, licensed, or otherwise applied” the challenged patents. *Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co., Ltd. v. Stratasys, Inc.*, IPR2025-00438, Paper 10, 3 (July 17, 2025). To the contrary, here,

Petitioners admitted in related IPRs that they “*applied*” and “*commercialized*” the Asserted Patents: “*Unlike Petitioners*, neither PO nor its predecessors ever *commercialized or applied the claimed technology* in any way.” See, e.g., IPR2025-00537, Paper 11, 2. Similarly, in *Intel*, the Director granted discretionary denial where, as here, that the “challenged patents have been in force over nine years, creating settled expectations, and Petitioner does not provide any persuasive reasoning why an *inter partes* review is an appropriate use of Board resources.” *Intel v. Proxense LLC*, IPR2025-00327, Paper 12, 3 (June 26, 2025).

Petitioners’ reliance on *Tesla v. Intell. Ventures* and *Tesla v. Navy* to argue that the “period of dormant existence since the ‘039 patent’s issuance” (Req. 5) fares no better. Both cases turned on “the complex and diverse litigation proceeding”—eleven patents spanning nine different families that “involve a diverse range of subject matter”—not upon the enforcement of the challenged patents. *Tesla, Inc. v. Intell. Ventures II*, IPR2025-00217, Paper 9, 2-3 (June 13, 2025); *Tesla, Inc. v. Navy*, IPR2025-00341, Paper 12, 2-3 (June 13, 2025). Here, the parallel litigation involves patents with similar subject matter and within the same patent family, as Petitioners concede. Req. 10.

Fourth, Petitioners’ suggestion that the PTAB’s invalidation of the ‘5801 Patent—the great-great grandparent of the ‘039—somehow further suggests that ‘039 Patent “is invalid” is unsupported. Req. 5. As an initial matter, this is an

improper new argument and should be rejected on that basis alone. *See* USPTO Director Review Process (“The Director will not consider new evidence or new arguments not part of the official record.”). Regardless, Petitioners ignore the record that confirms the claims of the ‘039 Patent are materially different from those of the ‘5801 Patent. *See* IPR2025-00535, Ex. 2009; IPR2025-00535, Paper 8 (Discretionary Denial Brief (“535 DD”)), 22-24;¹ *Nat’l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Canadian Pacific Ry., Ltd.*, 357 F.3d 1319, 1334 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (“A validity analysis must be conducted on a claim-by-claim basis.”). Moreover, as shown in PO’s Discretionary Denial brief, and not disputed by Petitioners, the same Examiner reviewed both the ‘039 Patent and the ‘5801 Patent and considered the ‘5801 reexamination decision while examining the ‘039 Patent. 535 DD, 23-24. As a result, PO has strong settled expectations of validity.

Fifth, Petitioners’ judicial estoppel argument against the Director and the USPTO, based on the USPTO’s intervenor brief in *Celgene*, is unfounded. Req. 6. *Celgene* addressed whether “the retroactive application of IPR proceedings to pre-AIA patents is [] an unconstitutional taking under the Fifth Amendment.” *Celgene*

¹ Petitioners wholesale copy-pasted their arguments from the 535 IPR into their Request for this IPR. PO cites to the record in the 535 IPR and other related IPRs to address Petitioners’ improper arguments.

Corp. v. Peter, 931 F.3d 1342, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2019). *Celgene* had nothing to do with the Director’s discretion to consider a PO’s settled expectations when deciding whether to institute an IPR review. Indeed, Congressional directive confirms that the Director, and her designees, enjoy a broad “nonappealable” discretion to determine “whether to institute an inter partes review.” 35 U.S.C. § 314(d). There is no judicial estoppel preventing the Director’s application of settled expectations. Req. 6.

Sixth, Petitioners’ assumption that the ‘039 Patent “would have [been invalidated] in the Meta IPR” is nothing more than speculation. Req. 6. IPR institution is not evidence of material error by the Examiner. *See Vital Connect, Inc. v. Bardy Diagnostics, Inc.*, IPR2023-00381, Paper 7, 20 (July 11, 2023). And, as shown in PO’s briefing in the related IPRs, the ‘336 patent, the great-grandparent of the ‘039 Patent with similar claims, survived *ex parte* reexamination without amendment or cancellation. IPR2025-00535, Paper 11, 3-4. Surviving an *ex parte* reexamination confirms PO’s settled expectations.

B. Petitioners Have No Legitimate Settled Expectations

Petitioners’ brand-new claim that they “had no reason to expect that the ‘039 Patent posed any threat worthy of a challenge at the Patent Office” is unsupported. Req. 7-8. None of Petitioners’ arguments establishes that they had any legitimate settled expectations.

First, Petitioners speculate that “the ’039 patent would be invalidated if it were ever challenged” and even posit that the “prior owner never tried enforcing it against anyone” because the ’5801 Patent was invalidated. Req. 7. The ’039 Patent claims are materially different from those of the ’5801 Patent and the Examiner considered the ’5801 reexamination during prosecution of the ’039 Patent. There is no reasonable basis to support this argument.

Second, a Petitioner does not establish its own settled expectations merely because the “Patent Owner did not previously assert the challenged patent against Petitioner.” *Kahoot! AS*, IPR2025-00696, Paper 12, 2. This is especially true here, where Petitioners openly admit that they have “*applied*” and “commercialized” PO’s patents yet claim they had no reason to expect that the ’039 Patent posed any threat. Req. 7-8.

Neither *Intel* nor *Shenzhen* support Petitioners’ conclusion that “when there is no reason to challenge a patent earlier in its term, the age of the patent should not protect it from review.” Req. 8. In *Intel*, like here, Petitioner did not have its own settled expectations where the patents were “in force over nine years.” *Intel*, IPR2025-00327, Paper 12, 2. And in *Shenzhen*, the Director found that the complexity of the parallel litigation, involving nine patents spanning six families with vast scope, along with the evidence that the challenged patents had not been commercialized or otherwise applied, “tip the balance against discretionary denial,”

not Petitioner's expectations. *Shenzhen*, IPR2025-00438, Paper 10, 2. Here, the parallel litigation involves patents from the same family and with similar subject matter. In addition, unlike *Shenzhen*, here the Petitioners admitted in related IPRs that they "*applied*" and "*commercialized*" the Asserted Patents, as established above.

III. This Decision Is Consistent with the Director's Other Decisions

Petitioners claim that "the Decision failed to consider factors that have resulted in the rejection of discretionary denial in other proceedings." Req. 8. Incorrect. The Decision states that "[a]lthough certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is *based on a holistic assessment* of all of the evidence and arguments presented." Decision, 2-3.

The petition lacks merits. The Request erroneously refers to the merits in the related IPR (IPR2025-00535), not the present IPR. Req. 9 (referencing the "content of the Meta IPR petition"). The Board's previous institution of the Meta IPR based on Neibauer is irrelevant to the present IPR, which asserts different prior art that has never been the basis for an institution decision.

Regardless, in its Discretionary Denial brief in this IPR, PO identified many deficiencies of this Petition on the merits. 536 DD, 44-62. These arguments and evidence, unrebutted by Petitioners in their Request, were included in the Decision's "holistic review" and are part of the Decision. Decision, 2-3.

Petitioners' argument the Petition's merits based on the invalidation of the '5801 Patent—the great-great-grandparent of the '039 Patent—is also wrong. Req. 9. Again, Petitioners' arguments are misplaced as the invalidation of the '5801 Patent was on Neibauer, different prior art than that asserted in this IPR.

Petitioners' reliance on *Intell. Ventures* is unavailing. Req. 9. There, an ancestor patent found unpatentable had “*similar claims.*” *Intell. Ventures*, IPR2025-00217, Paper 9, 2. Here, the '039 Patent claims are *substantially different* from those in the '5801 Patent. Further, unlike *Intell. Ventures*, the '039 Patent's great grandparent—the '336 Patent—survived an *ex parte* reexam, and all Asserted Patents spring from the '336 Patent. IPR2025-00535, Paper 11, 3-4.²

The Asserted Patents belong to a single family. Petitioners concede that “the subject matter is similar across the asserted patents” (Req. 10), yet rely on *Intell. Ventures* to argue that the Board is better suited than the district court to review their validity. Req. 10. As established above, *Intell. Ventures*, which involved eleven patents spanning nine different families with “a diverse range of subject matter,” is inapposite. *Intell. Ventures*, IPR2025-00217, Paper 9, 2-3. Here, the parallel

² *Padagis US LLC v. Neurelis, Inc.*, IPR2025-00464, Paper 12, 2-3 (July 16, 2025) is inapposite as it addresses priority dates, which are not an issue here.

litigation involves patents with similar subject matter and within the same patent family. *See* Req. 10.

Petitioners’ stipulation was untimely and ineffective. Petitioners complain the Decision made no mention of Petitioners’ eleventh-hour stipulation. Req. 10. But the timeliness and effectiveness of the stipulation was discussed extensively by both parties in the briefing for related IPRs. IPR2025-00535, Papers 12, 15. And the Decision consistently noted that “[a]lthough certain arguments are highlighted above, the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is *based on a holistic assessment of all of the evidence and arguments presented.*” Decision, 2-3.

IV. The Decision’s Factual Findings Regarding the Likely Time to Trial and Likelihood of a Stay are Supported by the Record

Petitioners fail to establish the Decision’s findings on the trial date and the likelihood of stay of trial court proceedings are wrong. Req. 11.

There is no dispute that the trial will happen before the FWD date. The parallel litigation is set for trial in April 2026. The Director has recently held that when “the district court judge has indicated an intention to maintain the current trial schedule and only delay the trial schedule under extraordinary circumstances,” the scheduled trial date should control. *Linkplay Technology Inc. et al. vs Sonos, Inc.*, IPR2025-00509, Paper 10, 2 (July 31, 2025). Here, Judge Gilstrap’s Docket Control Order states that “The jury selection is ‘a deadline that cannot be changed without

an acceptable showing of good cause. Good cause is not shown merely by indicating that the parties agree that the deadline should be changed.” 536 DD, 11. Thus, under *Linkplay*, the scheduled trial date controls.

In addition, the median time-to-trial statistics are not dispositive because the trial date was agreed to by the parties and has not changed. *See Linkplay*, IPR2025-00509, Paper 10, 2 (recognizing that even when “time-to-trial statistics suggest” a trial later than the FWD date, the parties’ agreed trial date should control). But even considering the median time-to-trial statistics, Petitioners admit that the trial date would still be before the FWD. Req. 11-12.

A stay of the litigation is unlikely. Petitioners’ new argument about the likelihood of a stay is at odds with Petitioners’ own Response. There, Petitioners stated “no litigation stay has been requested and no objective evidence exists regarding whether a stay in the litigation will be granted.” *Compare*. Req. 13 with Response, 18. Petitioners’ contention that a stay is certain “[i]f PO does not oppose a motion to stay” is irrelevant. Req. 13. PO has previously informed Petitioners that PO will oppose any request for a stay (536 DD, 8), and as of the date of this brief, Petitioners have not yet sought a stay.

V. Discretionary Denial Does Not Violate the Due Process Clause or the APA

Petitioners argue that the Decision violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment and the APA. Req. 13-15. This argument is unnecessary to preserve the

record as there are no appeals from institution decisions. 35 U.S.C. § 314(a). The argument also fails in view of the Director's prior decisions. *See, e.g., iRhythm Techs., Inc. v. Welch Allyn, Inc.*, IPR2025-00363, Paper 11 (July 3, 2025) (arguing the decision violated the Due Process Clause and the APA); Paper 13 (Aug. 5, 2025) (denying request for Director review).

PO's Discretionary Denial brief argued several bases for denial other than those set forth in the Director's March 2025 Memorandum. *See, e.g.,* 536 DD, 6-15 (*Fintiv* factors 1-3), 30-62 (*Fintiv* factors 5-6). Petitioners do not contend that these further grounds present any Constitutional infirmity.

In any case, Petitioners have not established a Due Process violation because Petitioners have not been deprived of any rights. The decision whether to institute an IPR proceeding is within the Director's unreviewable discretion and a petitioner has no right to such an institution. 35 U.S.C. § 314(d); *Cuozzo*, 579 U.S. at 273; *Mylan Labs. Ltd. v. Janssen Pharma., N.V.*, 989 F.3d 1375, 1382 (Fed. Cir. 2021).

Petitioners have also failed to establish any violation of the APA. Petitioners were on notice of the March 2025 Memorandum, had an opportunity to brief their arguments, and did so extensively. *See TQ Delta, LLC v. DISH Network LLC*, 929 F.3d 1350, 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (no APA violation where "the party asserting the APA violation 'had notice...and an opportunity to be heard'"). That Petitioners are dissatisfied with the Decision does not violate the APA.

VI. CONCLUSION

The Request should be denied.

Date: August 15, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Eugene Goryunov/

Eugene Goryunov (Reg. No. 61,579)
Homayoon Rafatijo (Reg. No. 80,870)

BROWN RUDNICK LLP

1900 N Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 536-1700
Fax: (202) 536-1701

Erick Robinson, Esq. (Reg. No. 51,354)

Jayne Partridge (Reg. No. 39,011)

Patrick M. Dunn (Reg. No. 70,474)

Jayne C. Piana (Reg. No. 48,424)

BROWN RUDNICK LLP

609 Main Street, Suite 3550
Houston, TX 77002
Tel: (281) 815-0511
Fax: (281) 605-5699

Ian G. DiBernardo (Reg. No. 40,991)

BROWN RUDNICK LLP

Times Square Tower, 47th Fl.
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036
Tel: (212) 209-4800
Fax: (212) 209-4801

*Attorneys for Patent Owner
Mobile Data Technologies LLC*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 15, 2025, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Patent Owner's Authorized Response to Petitioners' Request for Director Review to be served via electronic mail upon the following attorneys of record for the Petitioners:

Lori Gordon (Reg. No. 50,633)
Goodwin Procter LLP
1900 N St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 346-4000
Fax: (202) 346-4444
Gordon-ptab@goodwinlaw.com

Doug Kline (Reg. No. 35,574)
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
100 Northern Avenue
Boston, MA 02210
Phone: (617) 570-1000
Fax: (617) 523-1231
dkline@goodwinlaw.com

Naomi Birbach (Reg. No. 67,113)
Goodwin Procter LLP
620 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10018
Phone: (212) 813-8800
Fax: (212) 355-3333
NBirbach@goodwinlaw.com

Srikanth Reddy
(*pro hac vice* application to be filed)
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
100 Northern Avenue
Boston, MA 02210
Phone: (617) 570-1000
Fax: (617) 523-1231
sreddy@goodwinlaw.com

Date: August 15, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Eugene Goryunov/
Eugene Goryunov (Reg. No. 61,579)
BROWN RUDNICK LLP
1900 N Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 536-1700
Fax: (202) 536-1701

*Attorneys for Patent Owner
Mobile Data Technologies LLC*