

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

GRANITE VEHICLE VENTURES LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

TESLA, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 2:24-cv-01007-JRG

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

**NOTICE OF BROADENED SOTERA PLUS
STIPULATION OF DEFENDANT TESLA, INC.**

Defendant Tesla, Inc. (“Defendant”) filed petitions for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of all the patents in this proceeding (Civil Action No. 2:24-cv-01007-JRG, hereinafter “Proceeding”) with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (the “PTAB”). The following table identifies two of the IPR proceedings for two of the patents in this Proceeding, the date the IPR petitions were filed, the patents involved in the IPR proceedings, and the claims challenged in each IPR proceeding. The claims challenged in these two IPR proceedings include all the claims of the corresponding patents that are asserted against Defendant in this Proceeding.

IPR No.	Patent No.	IPR Petition Filed	Claims Challenged
IPR2025-00943	U.S. 11,597,402	May 5, 2025	1, 3-4, 6, 8-11, and 13-24
IPR2025-00944	U.S. 11,738,765	May 2, 2025	1-8 and 10-20

Defendant hereby notifies the Court and Plaintiff that Defendant is submitting the following broadened *Sotera* stipulations (“Broadened *Sotera* Plus stipulation”) in connection with IPR2025-00943 and IPR2025-00944 identified in the table above. *See Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.*, IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 at 18–19 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2020) (“*Sotera*”) (describing the standard, unbroadened *Sotera* stipulation).

Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 11,597,402

Defendant hereby provides its stipulation before this Court in view of the concurrent IPR (IPR2025-00943) against Plaintiff’s U.S. Patent No. 11,597,402 filed before the PTAB. If the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant’s Petition, Defendant stipulates for this Proceeding and against the ’402 Patent that it will not raise or pursue (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-00943, (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in instituted IPR2025-00943 (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of only prior art patents or printed publications), or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-00943, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on page 3 of the Petition. Defendant further stipulates that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution), it will only pursue in this Proceeding and against the ’402 Patent grounds based solely on system prior art or system prior art in combination with one or more of the following references:

Name	U.S. Patent No.
Debouk	U.S. Patent No. 8,618,922
Fields	U.S. Patent No. 11,175,660
Fung	U.S. Patent No. 9,751,534
An	U.S. Patent No. 9,063,543
Prokhorov	U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2016/0252903
Stenneth	U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2015/0314780
Schunder	U.S. Patent No. 9,451,030

DeRuyck	U.S. Patent No. 9,714,037
Gunderson	U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2007/0268158
Tsimhoni	U.S. Patent No. 9,242,647
Sako	U.S. Patent No. 10,139,824
Coelingh	U.S. Patent No. 10,086,844

In addition to categories (i)-(iii) above, this list reflects a further narrowing of asserted prior art by at least nine references out of those identified in Tesla's invalidity contentions. In the event the Court grants leave for Tesla to supplement its invalidity contentions at a later date, Tesla's stipulation is not intended to, and does not, preclude it from introducing additional prior art not currently disclosed in Tesla's invalidity contentions in combination with system prior art.

Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 11,738,765

Defendant hereby provides its stipulation before this Court in view of the concurrent IPR (IPR2025-00944) against Plaintiff's U.S. Patent No. 11,738,765 filed before the PTAB. If the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant's Petition, Defendant stipulates for this Proceeding and against the '765 Patent that it will not raise or pursue (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-00944, (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in instituted IPR2025-00944 (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of only prior art patents or printed publications), or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-00944, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on page 2-3 of the Petition. Defendant further stipulates that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution), it will only pursue in this Proceeding and against the '765 Patent grounds based solely on system prior art or system prior art in combination with one or more of the following references:

Name	U.S. Patent No.
Debouk	U.S. Patent No. 8,618,922

Fields	U.S. Patent No. 11,175,660
Fung	U.S. Patent No. 9,751,534
Prokhorov	U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2016/0252903
Stenneth	U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2015/0314780
Dolgov	U.S. Patent No. 8,874,305
Zhu	U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2014/0336935
Scofield	U.S. Patent No. 11,040,725
Grimm	U.S. Patent No. 9,430,944
Tsimhoni	U.S. Patent No. 9,242,647
Sako	U.S. Patent No. 10,139,824
Coelingh	U.S. Patent No. 10,086,844

In addition to categories (i)-(iii) above, this list reflects a further narrowing of asserted prior art by at least eight references out of those identified in Tesla's invalidity contentions. In the event the Court grants leave for Tesla to supplement its invalidity contentions at a later date, Tesla's stipulation is not intended to, and does not, preclude it from introducing additional prior art not currently disclosed in Tesla's invalidity contentions in combination with system prior art.

Defendant's Broadened *Sotera Plus* stipulations above are not intended and should not be construed to limit Defendant's ability to assert invalidity of any claims of the patents-at-issue in this lawsuit based on any other ground beyond those grounds identified in 35 U.S.C. § 311(b).

Dated: July 24, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Ashraf Fawzy

Ashraf Fawzy

afawzy@tesla.com

T. 202.905.9221

DC Bar No. 989132

Paul Margulies

pmargulies@tesla.com

DC Bar No. 10000297

T. 202.695.5388

Tesla, Inc.

800 Connecticut Ave. NW

Washington, DC 20006

Gina H. Cremona (*pro hac vice*)

gcremona@tesla.com

T. 650.647.0015

CA Bar No. 305392

Krista M. Carter (*pro hac vice*)

kricarter@tesla.com

T. 707.991.0552

CA Bar No. 225229

Terry Ahearn

tahearn@tesla.com

T. 408.204.7384

CA Bar No. 216543

Tesla, Inc.

3000 Hanover Street

Palo Alto, CA 94304

Allison Huebert

ahuebert@tesla.com

T. 512.557.8797

TX Bar No. 24124694

Jon Theodore Pearson

jonpearson@tesla.com

T. 737.367.4747

NV Bar No. 10182

Tesla, Inc.

1 Tesla Road

Austin, TX 78725

Counsel for Tesla, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule CV-5, I hereby certify that all counsel of record who have appeared in these cases are being served today with a copy of the foregoing via the Court's CM/ECF system.

Dated: July 24, 2025

/s/ Ashraf Fawzy
Ashraf Fawzy