

**From:** [Director Discretionary Decision](#)  
**To:** [Wayne Zou](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#)  
**Cc:** [Fussell, Tripp](#); [FW-CLIENT-Pantech-OnePlus-Service](#); [OnePlus-Pantech-IPR](#)  
**Subject:** RE: IPR2025-00887 and IPR2025-00888 - Request for Authorization to File A Short Supplemental Brief  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 1, 2025 1:38:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Petitioner is authorized to file the order as an exhibit, and should do so by COB today.

No additional briefing is authorized.

---

**From:** Wayne Zou <wayne.zou@bayes.law>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 30, 2025 2:49 PM  
**To:** Director\_Discretionary\_Decision <Director\_Discretionary\_Decision@uspto.gov>  
**Cc:** Fussell, Tripp <jfussell@mayerbrown.com>; FW-CLIENT-Pantech-OnePlus-Service <Pantech-OnePlus-Service@mayerbrown.com>; OnePlus-Pantech-IPR <OnePlus-Pantech-IPR@bayes.law>  
**Subject:** IPR2025-00887 and IPR2025-00888 - Request for Authorization to File A Short Supplemental Brief

**CAUTION:** This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. **PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE** before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

Dear Honorable Director,

Petitioner in IPR2025-00887 and IPR2025-00888 respectfully requests, for good cause, authorization to file a short supplemental brief in support of its pending Petitioner's Opposition to PO's Request for Discretionary Denial in each of these proceedings.

On September 29, 2025, the court of the pending parallel district litigation issued an Order adopting the joint stipulation to stay the case. *See Pantech Corp. v. OnePlus Tech. (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.*, 5:24-cv-00038, Dkt. No. 112 (Sept. 29, 2025) (E.D. Tex.). This Order materially alters the posture of the parallel litigation and is directly relevant to issues raised in the Petitioner's Opposition to PO's Request for Discretionary Denial.

To ensure the Director has the benefit of a complete and accurate record, Petitioner respectfully seeks leave to submit a concise, one-page supplemental brief addressing the significance of the stay. Petitioner would not object to Patent Owner filing a response of equal length. This limited briefing will aid the Director's decision while avoiding any undue burden.

Counsel for Patent Owner has been copied on this request. After conferring, Patent Owner opposed supplemental briefing "because the Director has already found that any FWD will come before a trial in this case." Patent Owner also stated "[t]o the extent Petitioner still plans to request additional briefing, Pantech's position is that Petitioner should request permission to file only the Order but

that no additional briefing is necessary. If briefing is granted, however, Pantech requests responsive briefing of equal length.”

Respectfully submitted,  
Zhiwei Zou,  
Lead Counsel on behalf of Petitioner

**Wayne Z. Zou, Ph.D.**

Partner | Patent Attorney

Bayes PLLC | [www.bayes.law](http://www.bayes.law)

8260 Greensboro Drive, Suite 625 | McLean, VA 22102

O (703) 995-9887 | F (703) 821-8128 | [wayne.zou@bayes.law](mailto:wayne.zou@bayes.law)



This e-mail message, including its attachments, is from a law firm and may contain privileged, confidential, or proprietary information or information otherwise exempt from disclosure. The message is intended only for person(s) addressed above. If you believe you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by return e-mail and delete all copies from your mailbox. Thank you.