

From: [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
To: [Christopher, Angelo](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
Cc: [Burnham, Daniel](#); [Hayes, Jennifer](#); [Girgis, Diana](#); sporteln@millerjohnson.com; griffithb@millerjohnson.com; cowdreyj@millerjohnson.com
Subject: RE: IPR2025-01020 - ASCENTCARE DENTAL PRODUCTS, INC., v. SOLMETEX, LLC - Discretionary Denial Reply Brief Request
Date: Monday, September 22, 2025 10:40:15 AM

Patent Owner is authorized to file a 5-page reply in IPR2025-01020 due no later than Wednesday, September 24, 2025, limited to addressing the arguments raised below. Patent Owner may file the district court order as an exhibit. Petitioner is authorized to file a 5-page sur-reply, due no later than Friday, September 26, 2025.

From: Christopher, Angelo <achristopher@nixonpeabody.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 4:04 PM
To: Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>
Cc: Burnham, Daniel <dburnham@nixonpeabody.com>; Hayes, Jennifer <jenhayes@nixonpeabody.com>; Girgis, Diana <dgirgis@nixonpeabody.com>; sporteln@millerjohnson.com; griffithb@millerjohnson.com; cowdreyj@millerjohnson.com
Subject: IPR2025-01020 - ASCENTCARE DENTAL PRODUCTS, INC., v. SOLMETEX, LLC - Discretionary Denial Reply Brief Request

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

Your Honors,

Patent Owner in the above-referenced IPR respectfully requests authorization to submit a 5-page reply brief in response to Petitioner's discretionary denial opposition brief (Paper 7). With respect to the *Fintiv* issues, good cause exists because Petitioner filed a *Sotera* stipulation after Patent Owner's discretionary denial brief, so Patent Owner could not address its scope and impact. With respect to § 325(d), good cause exists because the opposition mischaracterizes Patent Owner's arguments and the prosecution history. Patent Owner would submit its reply brief within 2 business days of being authorized.

Patent Owner also requests authorization to file a copy of a recent order in the parallel litigation denying Petitioner's motion to stay. Good cause exists because the order is relevant to the *Fintiv* analysis and was not available when Patent Owner filed its discretionary denial brief.

Petitioner indicated that it opposes a reply brief but does not oppose the filing of the district court order. Petitioner also indicated that if Patent Owner's request is granted, it would seek a 5-page sur-reply, which Patent Owner would not oppose.

Respectfully submitted,

Angelo Christopher

Reg No. 81,594

Counsel for Patent Owner



Angelo J. Christopher

Counsel

achristopher@nixonpeabody.com

T/ +1 312.977.4391 M/ +1 312.366.4745 F/ +1 844.450.2568

[Nixon Peabody LLP](#)

70 West Madison, Suite 5200, Chicago, IL 60602-4378

This email message and any attachments are confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client or other applicable privileges. The information is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s) of the message. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your email system. Unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Thank you.