

Filed: June 20, 2025

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**AMAZON.COM, INC.,**  
Petitioner,

v.

**VIRTAMOVE, CORP.,**  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2025-00566  
U.S. Patent No. 7,519,814

---

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION**  
**TO DISCRETIONARY DENIAL BRIEF**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION -----	1
II.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND -----	2
	A. Amazon’s Two Petitions Are Necessary and Fair -----	2
	B. Amazon Had No Part In Google’s Parallel Petitions -----	3
	C. The Co-Pending District Court Litigation Against Amazon Is Stayed -----	4
III.	ANALYSIS -----	5
	A. Google’s IPR Petitions Do Not Support Discretionary Denial -----	5
	1. Amazon Has No “Significant Relationship” With Google -----	6
	2. Amazon’s Petition Is Not a “Follow-On” to Google’s Petition -----	7
	B. Amazon’s Other IPR Petition Does Not Support Discretionary Denial -----	8
	C. PO’s “Power Imbalance” Argument Is Unfounded -----	8
	D. Instituting This IPR Will Be More Efficient Than Waiting for Any Trial That May Eventually Be Scheduled in District Court -----	9
IV.	CONCLUSION -----	12

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Cases:</i>	<i>Page(s):</i>
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. NL Giken Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00250, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. May 16, 2025) .....	10, 11
<i>Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Lionra Techs. Ltd.</i> , IPR2023-00670, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 23, 2023).....	7
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Express Mobile Inc.</i> , IPR2021-01455, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 4, 2022).....	7
<i>Finjan, Inc. v. FireEye, Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-03133, 2014 WL 2465267 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2014) .....	11
<i>General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha</i> , No. IPR2016-01357 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017).....	5, 6, 7
<i>Google LLC v. EcoFactor, Inc.</i> , No. 21-cv-03220-HSG, 2022 WL 6837715 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2022) .....	11
<i>HD Silicon Sols. LLC v. Microchip Tech. Inc.</i> , No. 21-cv-08295-SK, 2022 WL 3084315 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2022) .....	11
<i>Largan Precision Co., Ltd. v. Motorola Mobility LLC</i> , No. 21-cv-09138, 2022 WL 2954935 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 26, 2022).....	10
<i>Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC v. Yechezkal Evan Spero</i> , IPR2023-01034, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 19, 2024) .....	6
<i>Merck Sharp &amp; Dohme LLC v. Halozyme, Inc.</i> , PGR2025-00006, Paper 25 (P.T.A.B. June 12, 2025).....	10
<i>Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. v. Greenthread, LLC</i> , IPR2024-00553, Paper 25 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2024).....	6
<i>Neodron, Ltd. v. Lenovo Grp., Ltd.</i> , No. 19-cv-05644, 2020 WL 5074308 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2020) .....	11

<i>Netflix, Inc. v. CA, Inc.</i> , No. 21-cv-03649-EMC, 2022 WL 1144631 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2022).....	11
<i>Peloton Interactive, Inc. v. NEC Corp.</i> , IPR2023-01241, Paper 17 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 7, 2024) .....	7, 8
<i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00246, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. June 12, 2025) .....	10
<i>Twitch Interactive, Inc. v. Razdog Holdings LLC</i> , IPR2025-00307, Paper 18 (P.T.A.B. May 16, 2025) .....	10, 11
<i>Valve Corp. v. Elec. Scripting Prods., Inc.</i> , IPR2019-00062, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 2, 2019) .....	6, 7
<i>Videndum Production Solutions, Inc. v. Rotolight Limited</i> , IPR2023-0218, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 19, 2024) .....	7
<i>WSOU Invs. LLC v. Juniper Networks Inc.</i> , No. 21-cv-07557-BLF, 2022 WL 19709 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2022).....	11
<i>Zomm, LLC v. Apple Inc.</i> , 391 F. Supp. 3d 946 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	10
<i>Statutes and Rules:</i>	
35 U.S.C. § 21 .....	4
35 U.S.C. § 315.....	4
N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 16-2(c). .....	5

## TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 7,519,814 (“the ’814 patent”)
1002	Declaration of Dr. Darrell Long, Ph.D.
1003	Osman et al., <i>The Design and Implementation of Zap: A System for Migrating Computing Environments</i> , 5 Proc. of the Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (2002) (“Osman”)
1004	U.S. Patent No. 7,437,556 (“Tucker”)
1005	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/469,558 (“Tucker Provisional”)
1006	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0171678A1 (“Bandhole”)
1007	<i>Virtual Private Servers and Security Contexts</i> (“Gélinas”)
1008	File history of the ’814 patent
1009	Solaris 9 press release from Sun Microsystems
1010	B. Walters, “VmWare Virtual Platform.” Linux Journal, 1999.
1011	Soltesz et al., <i>Container-based operating system virtualization: a scalable, high-performance alternative to hypervisors</i> (2007)
1012	D. Price and A. Tucker. <i>Solaris zones: Operating system support for consolidating commercial workloads</i> . In Proceedings of the 18th Usenix LISA Conference, 2004.
1013	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/502,619

Exhibit No.	Description
1014	U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/512,103
1015	Declaration of Rachel Watters Regarding Osman
1016	Declaration of Jacques G�elinas Regarding Linux VServer
1017	Message to Linux Kernel Mailing List Regarding Linux VServer
1018	Slashdot post Regarding Linux VServer
1019	Petitioner’s Opening Claim Construction Brief in <i>VirtaMove, Corp. v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al.</i> , No. 7:24-cv-30-ADA-DTG (W.D. Tex.) (the “Litigation”)
1020	Patent Owner’s Sur-Reply Claim Construction Brief from the Litigation
1021	Excerpts from deposition of named inventor Donn Rochette
1022	J. Ball, “Managing Initscripts with Red Hat’s chkconfig.” Linux Journal, 2001.
1023	Kravetz, et al. “Enhancing Linux scheduler scalability.” <i>Proceedings of the Ottawa Linux Symposium, Ottawa, CA.</i> 2001.
1024	Scheduling order from the Litigation
1025	Order cancelling <i>Markman</i> hearing in the Litigation
1026	Order granting transfer in the Litigation
1027	Curriculum vitae of Dr. Darrell Long
1028	Patent Owner’s Infringement Contentions

Exhibit No.	Description
1029 - 1032	[Omitted]
1033	Order Extending Stay of District Court Litigation
1034	Docket Report for Patent Owner’s Case Against Google
1035	Docket Report for Patent Owner’s Case Against Amazon
1036	Patent Owner’s Complaint Against Amazon
1037	Patent Owner’s Complaint Against Google
1038	[Omitted]
1039	Objections to Transfer Order
1040	Magistrate Judge’s Order Granting Stay
1041	Order Overruling Objections to Transfer Order
1042	“Fortress’ Billions Quietly Power America’s Biggest Legal Fights,” Bloomberg Law (October 16, 2024)
1043	Excerpt of “Federal Court Management Statistics,” Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (March 2025).
1044	Docket Report for <i>Jawbone Innovations LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:22-cv-06727-TLT (N.D. Cal.).
1045	Proof of Service for Complaint Against Amazon
1046	Proof of Service for Complaint Against Google

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner (“PO”) seeks discretionary denial here based on parallel IPR petitions challenging the ’814 patent. Petitioner (“Amazon”) filed one of these parallel petitions to challenge claims not at issue in the Petition here. Amazon explained when filing its two petitions that both were necessary due to the length and complexity of the challenged claims. PO does not dispute that the challenged claims are lengthy and complex. Nor does PO dispute that the Board has recognized such length and complexity as a legitimate basis for instituting multiple petitions.

Google filed two petitions also. PO speculates that Amazon and Google are engaged in a “coordinated attack” here, but this speculation is incorrect. Amazon and Google filed their IPR petitions independently. Amazon had no advance notice of Google’s petitions or their contents. Amazon is simply defending itself because PO attacked Amazon with an invalid patent. Google is presumably doing the same.

PO argues that it will be overwhelmed by litigation expenses if the Board institutes petitions from both Amazon and Google, but this argument is not credible. PO decided to simultaneously pursue lawsuits against Amazon, Google, IBM, HP Enterprise, Microsoft, and Oracle in multiple district courts. If PO lacked the resources to fund major litigation, it would not have sued these six companies all at once. Regardless, instituting Amazon’s IPR here would reduce PO’s litigation expenses rather than increasing them because the district court case against Amazon in

the Northern District of California (“NDCA”) will almost certainly be stayed following the institution decision.

Apart from parallel petitions, PO raises no other arguments for discretionary denial. For example, PO does not dispute that the ’814 patent’s examiner never considered the prior art in the Petition here. And PO does not dispute that the co-pending district-court litigation has no operative schedule. Thus, the Director should reject PO’s request for discretionary denial and allow the Board to proceed to the merits of this IPR.

## **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

### **A. Amazon’s Two Petitions Are Necessary and Fair.**

The Petition here challenges claims 3, 5, 7, 11-12, 15-16, and 31-34 of the ’814 patent. (Paper 1.) This is the second IPR petition that Amazon filed against the ’814 patent. (*Id.* at 66-67.) Amazon previously filed another petition challenging claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-10 and 13-14. (IPR2025-00563, Paper 1 (“First Petition”).) The First Petition challenges claims that PO is currently asserting against Amazon in co-pending district court litigation while the petition here challenges claims not currently asserted against Amazon in the district court. (Paper 1 (“Second Petition”) at 66-67.) Amazon filed both petitions on January 31, 2025 and explained that two petitions were necessary due to the length and complexity of the claims. (*Id.*)

Amazon also explained why the two parallel petitions would impose no inefficiency or unfair disadvantage on PO. (*Id.*) For example, Amazon explained that the petitions rely on the same claim constructions and the same expert declarant. (*Id.*) Further, the two petitions share a primary reference. (*Compare id.* at 9 with First Petition at 9 (Osman).) Amazon also explained that any potential inefficiency or disadvantage to PO arising from the two petitions can be resolved by consolidating both IPRs. (Second Petition at 66.) PO does not dispute that consolidating the IPRs would obviate any inefficiency or disadvantage.

The Second Petition would be unnecessary if PO had stipulated not to assert the patent claims at issue here against Amazon in the future. But PO has not offered such a stipulation and has instead reserved the right to amend its infringement contentions in district court to assert additional claims. (Ex. 1028 at 1.) Thus, Amazon's Second Petition remains necessary.

**B. Amazon Had No Part In Google's Parallel Petitions.**

Google filed its two IPR petitions against the '814 patent on January 31, 2025. (IPR2025-00487, Paper 1; IPR2025-00488, Paper 1.) Amazon had no involvement in Google's petitions. The prior art in Google's petitions does not overlap at all with the prior art relied on in Amazon's Petition here. (*Id.*)

Google and Amazon are both defending district court cases in which PO asserts the '814 patent, but the cases are pending in different courts. (Ex. 1034 at 1;

Ex. 1035 at 1.) Google’s accused products are different from Amazon’s accused products. (Ex. 1036 ¶ 14; Ex. 1037 ¶ 12.) PO does not allege that Google’s infringement depends at all on Amazon. (*See generally* Ex. 1037.)

Although Google filed its IPR petitions on the same day as Amazon’s filing here, this timing was not coordinated. The timing was driven by the service of PO’s district-court complaints against Amazon and Google. PO served these complaints against Amazon and Google one day apart. (Ex. 1045 (Feb. 1, 2024); Ex. 1046 (Feb. 2, 2024).) The statutory deadlines for Amazon and Google both fell on a weekend, and therefore moved to the following Monday. 35 U.S.C. § 315(b); 35 U.S.C. § 21. Amazon and Google each independently filed their petitions on the business day before that Monday deadline.

**C. The Co-Pending District Court Litigation Against Amazon Is Stayed.**

On January 26, 2024, PO sued Amazon in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas. (Ex. 1036.) Amazon moved to transfer the case to the Northern District of California (“NDCA”). (Ex. 1026 at 1.) The magistrate judge granted Amazon’s transfer motion, but stayed the transfer for 30 days to allow time for PO to appeal to the district judge. (*Id.* at 6.)

On February 6, 2025, PO appealed the magistrate’s transfer order to the district judge by filing objections to the order. (Ex. 1039.) The magistrate judge then stayed the case for three additional months. (Ex. 1040.) On May 21, 2025, the

district judge overruled PO's objections to the transfer order. (Ex. 1041.) The district judge extended the stay again for another three months, giving PO an opportunity to seek mandamus from the Federal Circuit. (Ex. 1033.) PO later sought mandamus in its case against Google, but has not done so in its case against Amazon.

Absent a further stay, the district court will transfer the case to NDCA on August 23, 2025. (*Id.*) After the transfer, the court in NDCA will set a new case schedule. N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 16-2(c).<sup>1</sup>

### III. ANALYSIS

#### A. Google's IPR Petitions Do Not Support Discretionary Denial.

The Board's decision in *General Plastic Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha*, No. IPR2016-01357 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2017) (Paper 19) (precedential), sets forth factors to consider when deciding whether to institute an IPR petition against a patent that was also challenged in another IPR petition. For two threshold reasons explained below, the *General Plastic* factors cannot support discretionary denial here. And PO has not identified any other precedent that would support its request for discretionary denial based on Google's petitions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://cand.uscourts.gov/rules/civil-local-rules/>.

**1. Amazon Has No “Significant Relationship” With Google.**

Although the *General Plastic* factors typically apply to multiple petitions filed by the same petitioner, the Board has also applied these factors to deny institution where a later petitioner had a “significant relationship” with an earlier petitioner. *Valve Corp. v. Elec. Scripting Prods., Inc.*, IPR2019-00062, Paper 11 at 10 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 2, 2019) (precedential) (earlier and later petitioners were co-defendants accused of infringement based on the same product). No such relationship exists here.

PO argues here that “both Amazon and Google’s interests can be represented by a single Petition challenging validity” (Paper 6 at 2), but this argument is unsupported by any evidence and contrary to precedent. PO sued Amazon and Google in separate cases involving separate sets of accused products. (*Supra*, pp. 3-4.) Amazon and Google are vigorous competitors that filed their IPR petitions independently. Thus, they have no “significant relationship” with each other. *E.g.*, *Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. v. Greenthread, LLC*, IPR2024-00553, Paper 25 at 15 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2024) (no significant relationship where the parties were not co-defendants, were competitors, and had different allegedly infringing products); *Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC v. Yechezkal Evan Spero*, IPR2023-01034, Paper 17 at 6-7 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 19, 2024) (no significant relationship where two direct competitors were accused of infringing based on two different products, even if the accused products used the same type of headlight technology and were both developed jointly with the same

third party); *Facebook, Inc. v. Express Mobile Inc.*, IPR2021-01455, Paper 11 at 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 4, 2022) (no significant relationship where two parties were sued for infringing the same patent on the same day and coordinated their defenses).

Because Amazon and Google “are neither the same party, nor possess a significant relationship under *Valve*,” discretionary denial is unwarranted. *Videndum Production Solutions, Inc. v. Rotolight Limited*, IPR2023-0218, Paper 12 at 6 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 19, 2024) (director review). The absence of any significant relationship “necessarily outweighs” any other *General Plastic* factors. *Id.*

## **2. Amazon’s Petition Is Not a “Follow-On” to Google’s Petition.**

Discretionary denial under *General Plastic* is inappropriate here for a second, independent reason. *General Plastic* provides for discretionary denial of “follow-on petitions.” *General Plastic*, Paper 19 at 16; *see also id.* at 8 (listing factors for “determining whether to ... deny a petition that challenges the same patent *as a previous petition*”), 17, 21 (describing prejudice caused by “*staggered*” petitions) (emphasis added). Here, Amazon filed its petitions on the same day as Google’s petitions. (*Supra*, pp. 3-4.) Petitions filed on the same day “do not implicate the roadmapping concerns that *General Plastic* seeks to alleviate.” *Cisco Sys., Inc. v. Lionra Techs. Ltd.*, IPR2023-00670, Paper 10 at 18-19 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 23, 2023); *Peloton Interactive, Inc. v. NEC Corp.*, IPR2023-01241, Paper 17 at 16 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 7, 2024). Thus, Google’s petitions do not support discretionary denial here.

**B. Amazon’s Other IPR Petition Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.**

Amazon filed its Second Petition here to address claims that PO has not asserted against Amazon in the district court, but that PO may assert against Amazon in the future. (Paper 1 at 66-67.) PO could eliminate the need for this Second Petition by stipulating not to assert these claims against Amazon, but PO has not done so. PO’s failure to stipulate contravenes the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (“CTPG”), which directs patent owners to “proffer any necessary stipulations” when arguing that a second petition is unnecessary. CTPG<sup>2</sup> at 60-61. Instead of providing the necessary stipulation, PO has reserved the right to amend its infringement contentions and thereby assert additional claims. (Ex. 1028 at 1.) Accordingly, Amazon’s Second Petition remains necessary and IPRs should be instituted for both petitions. *See Peloton*, Paper 17 at 17 (instituting second petition challenging unasserted claims because patent owner had reserved the right to amend its infringement contentions).

**C. PO’s “Power Imbalance” Argument Is Unfounded.**

PO also argues that discretionary denial is warranted based on a “power imbalance” between itself and Amazon. (Paper 6 at 1.) To the extent PO’s alleged “power imbalance” refers to the financial burden that multiple IPRs may impose on

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/tpgnov.pdf>.

a smaller company, that argument lacks merit under the circumstances here. PO elected to simultaneously pursue lawsuits against Amazon, Google, Hewlett Packard Enterprise, IBM, Microsoft, and Oracle, in three different district courts. (Paper 3 at 1-2.) Such litigation campaigns are routinely financed by deep-pocketed litigation funders, who provide billions of dollars in funding to patent plaintiffs. (Ex. 1042 at 1.) Tellingly, PO never claims to be paying its own legal expenses. PO's decision to sue six major technology companies at once makes it highly likely that a third-party funder with no shortage of resources is inciting the litigation campaign.

Regardless of PO's funding source, the expense of multiple IPR proceedings does not support discretionary denial here because (1) it is a fraction of the cost PO would have budgeted for the co-pending district court proceedings and (2) it is a foreseeable consequence of PO's own decision to sue six companies at once in different courts. The Director should not immunize invalid patent claims from meritorious IPR petitions merely because the patentee elected to sue multiple defendants. A patent owner who chooses to sue many companies at once is not unfairly prejudiced when each company defends itself in the most efficient forum.

**D. Instituting This IPR Will Be More Efficient Than Waiting for Any Trial That May Eventually Be Scheduled in District Court.**

The district-court case against Amazon is currently stayed and has no operative schedule or trial date. (*Supra*, pp. 4-5.) A schedule will be set only after

the case is transferred to NDCA, no earlier than August 23, 2025. (*Id.*) These facts weigh against discretionary denial. *See ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc.*, IPR2025-00246, Paper 10 (P.T.A.B. June 12, 2025) (rejecting discretionary denial where case was stayed); *Merck Sharp & Dohme LLC v. Halozyme, Inc.*, PGR2025-00006, Paper 25 (P.T.A.B. June 12, 2025) (rejecting discretionary denial where no trial date was set). And, the NDCA’s median time-to-trial statistics suggest that any trial that is scheduled following the transfer would begin no earlier than 2028—long after the projected final written decision in this case. (Ex. 1043; *see also* Paper 5 (Notice of Filing Date Accorded).)<sup>3</sup> These statistics weigh in favor of proceeding with this IPR. *See Twitch Interactive, Inc. v. Razdog Holdings LLC*, IPR2025-00307, Paper 18 at 2-3 (P.T.A.B. May 16, 2025); *Amazon.com, Inc. v. NL Giken Inc.*, IPR2025-00250, Paper 14 at 2 (P.T.A.B. May 16, 2025).

Further, as the Director has recognized, if the Board institutes an IPR, the court in NDCA is likely to stay the case until the IPR is complete. *Twitch*, Paper 18 at 2-3; *see also, e.g., Largan Precision Co., Ltd. v. Motorola Mobility LLC*, No. 21-cv-09138, 2022 WL 2954935, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 26, 2022); *Zomm, LLC v. Apple*

---

<sup>3</sup> This timeline for trial in the district court is consistent with Amazon’s experience in another case transferred to the NDCA, where the judge set a trial date 30 months after transfer. (Ex. 1044 at Dkt. Nos. 61, 96.)

Amazon.com, Inc. v. VirtaMove, Corp.  
Opposition to Discretionary Denial – U.S. Patent 7,519,814

*Inc.*, 391 F. Supp. 3d 946, 956 (N.D. Cal. 2019); *Finjan, Inc. v. FireEye, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-03133, 2014 WL 2465267, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2014).

Such stays are routinely granted in NDCA, even when IPRs are instituted for only a subset of the patents asserted in a case. *E.g.*, *Google LLC v. EcoFactor, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-03220-HSG, 2022 WL 6837715 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2022); *HD Silicon Sols. LLC v. Microchip Tech. Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08295-SK, 2022 WL 3084315 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2022); *Netflix, Inc. v. CA, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-03649-EMC, 2022 WL 1144631 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2022); *WSOU Invs. LLC v. Juniper Networks Inc.*, No. 21-cv-07557-BLF, 2022 WL 19709 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2022); *Neodron, Ltd. v. Lenovo Grp., Ltd.*, No. 19-cv-05644, 2020 WL 5074308 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2020).

If the Board institutes this IPR, the final written decision will be due in 2026. (See Paper 5 (filing date accorded March 10, 2025)). This will be much faster than waiting for a trial in the district court, with or without a further stay. Thus, the circumstances here are ideal for achieving the efficiency benefits that Congress designed IPRs to provide. *See* H.R. Rep. No. 112-98, at 39-40 (2011) (IPRs were designed to provide “a more efficient system for challenging patents that should not have issued” and to reduce “unwarranted litigation costs”); *see also Twitch*, Paper 18 at 2-3; *Amazon.com, Inc.*, Paper 14 at 2.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Amazon respectfully requests that the Director reject PO's request for discretionary denial and allow the Board to proceed to the merits of this IPR.

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

June 20, 2025

/Jeremy A. Anapol/

Colin B. Heideman (Reg. No. 61,513)

Joseph R. Re (Reg. No. 31,291)

Jeremy A. Anapol (Reg. No. 75,686)

Nathan D. Reeves (Reg. No. 77,806)

Logan P. Young (Reg. No. 79,294)

Counsel for Petitioner,  
AMAZON.COM, INC.

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.24(d), the undersigned certifies that this **PETITIONER’S OPPOSITION TO DISCRETIONARY DENIAL BRIEF** contains 2,565 words according to the word-processing program used to prepare this paper excluding the portions exempted under 37 C.F.R. §42.24(a)(1).

June 20, 2025

/Jeremy A. Anapol/  
Colin B. Heideman (Reg. No. 61,513)  
Joseph R. Re (Reg. No. 31,291)  
Jeremy A. Anapol (Reg. No. 75,686)  
Nathan D. Reeves (Reg. No. 77,806)  
Logan P. Young (Reg. No. 79,294)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO DISCRETIONARY DENIAL BRIEF** is being served on June 20, 2025, via e-mail on counsel of record for Patent Owner at the address below:

Reza Mirzaie  
Marc A. Fenster  
Neil Rubin  
James A. Milkey

Russ, August & Kabat  
12424 Wilshire Blvd., 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Qi (Peter) Tong

8080 N. Central Expy., Suite 1503  
Dallas, TX 75206

Email: rak\_virtamove@raklaw.com

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

June 20, 2025

/Jeremy A. Anapol/  
Colin B. Heideman (Reg. No. 61,513)  
Joseph R. Re (Reg. No. 31,291)  
Jeremy A. Anapol (Reg. No. 75,686)  
Nathan D. Reeves (Reg. No. 77,806)  
Logan P. Young (Reg. No. 79,294)