

John M. Desmarais (CA SBN 320875)  
Peter C. Magic (CA SBN 278917)  
Kevin J. Gu (CA SBN 335053)  
Kyle Curry (CA SBN 341242)

**DESMARAIS LLP**

101 California Street, Suite 3000  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel.: (415) 573-1905  
Fax: (415) 573-1901  
jdesmarais@desmaraisllp.com  
pmagic@desmaraisllp.com  
kgu@desmaraisllp.com  
kcurry@desmaraisllp.com

Cosmin Maier (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Lindsey E. Miller (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Joze Welsh (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Ido Sadeh (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Asim Zaidi (admitted *pro hac vice*)

**DESMARAIS LLP**

230 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10169  
Tel.: (212) 351-3400  
Fax: (212) 351-3401  
cmaier@desmaraisllp.com  
lmiller@desmaraisllp.com  
jwelsh@desmaraisllp.com  
isadeh@desmaraisllp.com  
azaidi@desmaraisllp.com

*Counsel for Defendant Apple Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

TELCOM VENTURES LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:25-cv-05041

**NOTICE OF SOTERA PLUS  
STIPULATION OF DEFENDANT APPLE  
INC.**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Defendant Apple Inc. (“Defendant”) filed petitions for *Inter Partes* Review (“IPR”) of all patents in this lawsuit with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (the “PTAB”). The following table identifies the IPR proceedings for the eight patents asserted in this lawsuit, the date the IPR petitions were filed, the patents involved in the IPR proceeding, and the claims challenged in each IPR proceeding. The claims challenged in these eight IPR proceedings include all of the claims of the corresponding patents that are asserted against Defendant in this litigation.

<b>IPR No.</b>	<b>Patent No.</b>	<b>IPR Petition Filed</b>	<b>Claims Challenged</b>
IPR2025-01232	9,462,411	August 5, 2025	1-4
IPR2025-01233	9,832,708	August 5, 2025	1-19
IPR2025-01234	10,219,199	August 5, 2025	1-19
IPR2025-01235	10,674,432	August 5, 2025	1-17
IPR2025-01236	11,770,756	August 5, 2025	1-18
IPR2025-01237	11,924,743	August 5, 2025	1-14
IPR2025-01238	11,937,172	August 5, 2025	1-16
IPR2025-01239	12,028,793	August 5, 2025	1-11

Defendant hereby notifies the Court and Plaintiff that Defendant is submitting the following broadened *Sotera* stipulation (“*Sotera* Plus stipulation”) in connection with the IPR petitions 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). The stipulation for each patent and corresponding IPR petition is identical.

**Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 9,462,411 (IPR2025-01232)**

Defendant hereby stipulates, broader than the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*, that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to

Defendant's petition against Plaintiff's U.S. Patent No. 9,462,411 (IPR2025-01232), Defendant will not pursue in this litigation:

- (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-01232,
- (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications),
- (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01232, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on page 19 of the Petition, or
- (iv) any ground based on a system which corresponds to a patent or printed publication asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01232.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to rely on its own products and systems as prior art in the litigation, including to demonstrate that Apple invented the claimed subject matter first under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), nor does it limit Apple's ability to rely on any patents or patent publications assigned to Apple as evidence of Apple's prior invention. Likewise, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to demonstrate that the '411 Patent claims are invalid based on Apple's own products and systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

In the IPR, Apple does not and cannot raise a §102(g) defense. In the IPR, Apple likewise was not permitted to raise any grounds based on its own products or systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public. *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 136 F.4th 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (recognizing that assertions "that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use...could not be raised during an IPR."). Therefore, there will be no overlap between the issues raised in the Petition and the district court, and the IPRs will serve as a "true

alternative” to the district court proceeding for those invalidity issues which can be raised in an IPR proceeding.

**Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 9,832,708 (IPR2025-01233)**

Defendant hereby stipulates, broader than the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*, that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant’s petition against Plaintiff’s U.S. Patent No. 9,832,708 (IPR2025-01233), Defendant will not pursue in this litigation:

- (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-01233,
- (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications),
- (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01233, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on page 14 of the Petition, or
- (iv) any ground based on a system which corresponds to a patent or printed publication asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01233.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation does not limit Apple’s ability to rely on its own products and systems as prior art in the litigation, including to demonstrate that Apple invented the claimed subject matter first under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), nor does it limit Apple’s ability to rely on any patents or patent publications assigned to Apple as evidence of Apple’s prior invention. Likewise, this stipulation does not limit Apple’s ability to demonstrate that the ’708 Patent claims are invalid based on Apple’s own products and systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

In the IPR, Apple does not and cannot raise a §102(g) defense. In the IPR, Apple likewise

was not permitted to raise any grounds based on its own products or systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public. *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 136 F.4th 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (recognizing that assertions “that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use...could not be raised during an IPR.”). Therefore, there will be no overlap between the issues raised in the Petition and the district court, and the IPRs will serve as a “true alternative” to the district court proceeding for those invalidity issues which can be raised in an IPR proceeding.

**Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 10,219,199 (IPR2025-01234)**

Defendant hereby stipulates, broader than the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*, that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant’s petition against Plaintiff’s U.S. Patent No. 10,219,199 (IPR2025-01234), Defendant will not pursue in this litigation:

- (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-01234,
- (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications),
- (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01234, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on pages 19-20 of the Petition, or
- (iv) any ground based on a system which corresponds to a patent or printed publication asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01234.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation does not limit Apple’s ability to rely on its own products and systems as prior art in the litigation, including to demonstrate that Apple invented the claimed subject matter first under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), nor does it limit

Apple's ability to rely on any patents or patent publications assigned to Apple as evidence of Apple's prior invention. Likewise, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to demonstrate that the '199 Patent claims are invalid based on Apple's own products and systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

In the IPR, Apple does not and cannot raise a §102(g) defense. In the IPR, Apple likewise was not permitted to raise any grounds based on its own products or systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public. *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 136 F.4th 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (recognizing that assertions "that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use...could not be raised during an IPR."). Therefore, there will be no overlap between the issues raised in the Petition and the district court, and the IPRs will serve as a "true alternative" to the district court proceeding for those invalidity issues which can be raised in an IPR proceeding.

**Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 10,674,432 (IPR2025-01235)**

Defendant hereby stipulates, broader than the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*, that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant's petition against Plaintiff's U.S. Patent No. 10,674,432 (IPR2025-01235), Defendant will not pursue in this litigation:

- (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-01235,
- (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications),
- (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01235, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on pages 23-24 of the Petition, or

- (iv) any ground based on a system which corresponds to a patent or printed publication asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01235.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to rely on its own products and systems as prior art in the litigation, including to demonstrate that Apple invented the claimed subject matter first under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), nor does it limit Apple's ability to rely on any patents or patent publications assigned to Apple as evidence of Apple's prior invention. Likewise, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to demonstrate that the '432 Patent claims are invalid based on Apple's own products and systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

In the IPR, Apple does not and cannot raise a §102(g) defense. In the IPR, Apple likewise was not permitted to raise any grounds based on its own products or systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public. *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 136 F.4th 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (recognizing that assertions "that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use...could not be raised during an IPR."). Therefore, there will be no overlap between the issues raised in the Petition and the district court, and the IPRs will serve as a "true alternative" to the district court proceeding for those invalidity issues which can be raised in an IPR proceeding.

**Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 11,770,756 (IPR2025-01236)**

Defendant hereby stipulates, broader than the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*, that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant's petition against Plaintiff's U.S. Patent No. 11,770,756 (IPR2025-01236), Defendant will not pursue in this litigation:

- (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-01236,
- (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that

instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications),

- (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01236, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on pages 18-19 of the Petition, or
- (iv) any ground based on a system which corresponds to a patent or printed publication asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01236.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to rely on its own products and systems as prior art in the litigation, including to demonstrate that Apple invented the claimed subject matter first under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), nor does it limit Apple's ability to rely on any patents or patent publications assigned to Apple as evidence of Apple's prior invention. Likewise, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to demonstrate that the '756 Patent claims are invalid based on Apple's own products and systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

In the IPR, Apple does not and cannot raise a §102(g) defense. In the IPR, Apple likewise was not permitted to raise any grounds based on its own products or systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public. *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 136 F.4th 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (recognizing that assertions "that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use...could not be raised during an IPR."). Therefore, there will be no overlap between the issues raised in the Petition and the district court, and the IPRs will serve as a "true alternative" to the district court proceeding for those invalidity issues which can be raised in an IPR proceeding.

**Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 11,924,743 (IPR2025-01237)**

Defendant hereby stipulates, broader than the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*,

that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant's petition against Plaintiff's U.S. Patent No. 11,924,743 (IPR2025-01237), Defendant will not pursue in this litigation:

- (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-01237,
- (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications),
- (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01237, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on pages 18-19 of the Petition, or
- (iv) any ground based on a system which corresponds to a patent or printed publication asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01237.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to rely on its own products and systems as prior art in the litigation, including to demonstrate that Apple invented the claimed subject matter first under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), nor does it limit Apple's ability to rely on any patents or patent publications assigned to Apple as evidence of Apple's prior invention. Likewise, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to demonstrate that the '743 Patent claims are invalid based on Apple's own products and systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

In the IPR, Apple does not and cannot raise a §102(g) defense. In the IPR, Apple likewise was not permitted to raise any grounds based on its own products or systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public. *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 136 F.4th 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (recognizing that assertions "that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use...could not be raised during an IPR."). Therefore, there will be no overlap

between the issues raised in the Petition and the district court, and the IPRs will serve as a “true alternative” to the district court proceeding for those invalidity issues which can be raised in an IPR proceeding.

**Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 11,937,172 (IPR2025-01238)**

Defendant hereby stipulates, broader than the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*, that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant’s petition against Plaintiff’s U.S. Patent No. 11,937,172 (IPR2025-01238), Defendant will not pursue in this litigation:

- (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-01238,
- (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications),
- (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01238, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on pages 17-18 of the Petition, or
- (iv) any ground based on a system which corresponds to a patent or printed publication asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01238.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation does not limit Apple’s ability to rely on its own products and systems as prior art in the litigation, including to demonstrate that Apple invented the claimed subject matter first under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), nor does it limit Apple’s ability to rely on any patents or patent publications assigned to Apple as evidence of Apple’s prior invention. Likewise, this stipulation does not limit Apple’s ability to demonstrate that the ’172 Patent claims are invalid based on Apple’s own products and systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

In the IPR, Apple does not and cannot raise a §102(g) defense. In the IPR, Apple likewise was not permitted to raise any grounds based on its own products or systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public. *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 136 F.4th 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (recognizing that assertions “that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use...could not be raised during an IPR.”). Therefore, there will be no overlap between the issues raised in the Petition and the district court, and the IPRs will serve as a “true alternative” to the district court proceeding for those invalidity issues which can be raised in an IPR proceeding.

**Stipulation for U.S. Patent No. 12,028,793 (IPR2025-01239)**

Defendant hereby stipulates, broader than the stipulation made by the Petitioner in *Sotera*, that if the PTAB institutes an IPR (and does not subsequently vacate institution) in response to Defendant’s petition against Plaintiff’s U.S. Patent No. 12,028,793 (IPR2025-01239), Defendant will not pursue in this litigation:

- (i) the specific grounds raised in IPR2025-01239,
- (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB in that instituted proceeding (i.e., any ground that could have reasonably been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications),
- (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the references asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01239, as reflected in the table summarizing the Statutory Grounds for Challenges on pages 19-20 of the Petition, or
- (iv) any ground based on a system which corresponds to a patent or printed publication asserted as part of a ground raised in IPR2025-01239.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, this stipulation does not limit Apple’s ability to rely on its own products and systems as prior art in the litigation, including to demonstrate

that Apple invented the claimed subject matter first under 35 U.S.C. §102(g), nor does it limit Apple's ability to rely on any patents or patent publications assigned to Apple as evidence of Apple's prior invention. Likewise, this stipulation does not limit Apple's ability to demonstrate that the '793 Patent claims are invalid based on Apple's own products and systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

In the IPR, Apple does not and cannot raise a §102(g) defense. In the IPR, Apple likewise was not permitted to raise any grounds based on its own products or systems being in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public. *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 136 F.4th 1354, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (recognizing that assertions "that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use...could not be raised during an IPR."). Therefore, there will be no overlap between the issues raised in the Petition and the district court, and the IPRs will serve as a "true alternative" to the district court proceeding for those invalidity issues which can be raised in an IPR proceeding.

Defendant's *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 asserted in this lawsuit based on any other ground.

Dated: September 4, 2025

/s/ Peter C. Magic  
John M. Desmarais (CA SBN 320875)  
Peter C. Magic (CA SBN 278917)  
Kevin J. Gu (CA SBN 335053)  
Kyle Curry (CA SBN 341242)  
DESMARAIS LLP  
101 California Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel: 415-573-1900  
Fax: 415-573-1901  
jdesmarais@desmaraisllp.com  
pmagic@desmaraisllp.com  
kcurry@desmaraisllp.com  
kgu@desmaraisllp.com

Cosmin Maier (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Lindsey E. Miller (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Joze F. Welsh (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Asim H. Zaidi (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Ido Sadeh (admitted *pro hac vice*)

**DESMARAIS LLP**

230 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10169

T: 212-351-3400

F: 212-351-3401

cmaier@desmaraisllp.com

lmiller@desmaraisllp.com

jwelsh@desmaraisllp.com

azaidi@desmaraisllp.com

isadeh@desmaraisllp.com

*Counsel for Defendant Apple Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that on September 4, 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system, which shall send notification of such filing to all counsel of record at their email address on file with the Court.

/s/ Peter C. Magic  
Peter C. Magic