

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

HBCU MESSAGING US LP,
Patent Owner

IPR2025-01493
U.S. Patent No. 11,089,450

**PATENT OWNER'S AUTHORIZED REPLY TO
PETITIONER'S DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OPPOSITION**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Submitted Electronically via PTAB E2E

I. INSTITUTION IS NOT PROPER UNDER § 325(D)

Petitioner's response to Patent Owner's request for a discretionary denial should be rejected *first* because its arguments come too late. Petitioner's material error arguments should have been made within the Petition itself. *See Advanced Bionics, LLC v. MED-EL Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH*, IPR2019-01469, Paper 6, 8-9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020) (Petitioner bears the burden "to make a showing of material error" under §325); *Becton, Dickinson & Co. v. B. Braun Melsungen AG*, IPR2017-01586, Paper 8, 17-18 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2017). Indeed, the six *Becton* factors "should be read broadly . . . to apply to any situation in which a petition relies on the same or substantially the same art or arguments previously presented to the Office." *Id.* at 10. That is exactly the case here, as set forth within Patent Owner's Discretionary Denial Brief. (Paper 7 at 3-5.)

Second, Petitioner's untimely arguments are factually wrong. The Examiner conducted twenty independent searches over six separate dates, not just the five searches on the two dates cited in Petitioner's response. (Ex. 1002 at 18, 56-57.) The Examiner then applied narrower search strings and terms, including the term "WLAN," but the earlier searches encompassed broader categories of art.

Third, Petitioner failed to explain why those search results were supposedly inadequate. This is especially true given that Petitioner provides zero information on how the Examiner surveyed the various search results and selected art to apply.

Fourth, Petitioner is also silent on why the references before the original Examiner were supposedly “inadequate.” As set forth in Patent Owner’s Discretionary Denial Brief, the Examiner had the same substantive Tsampalis reference, as well as multiple other references that were substantively cumulative with Horvath. (Paper 7 at 3-5.) Nothing whatsoever suggests that the Examiner failed to perform a thorough analysis that found the claims patentable for the same reasons Petitioner’s asserted art likewise fails here.

Fifth, Petitioner’s references to invalidation of the European counterpart make no sense. Materials from the German proceedings were before the Examiner in the original prosecution here, the claims naturally include elements and features different from the EP invalidated (and allowed claims), and the claims here were *allowed* over the litigation documents and prior art from the German proceedings.

Sixth, Apple’s grumbling that a *multi-trillion dollar company* could not be bothered to track two dozen U.S. family patents issuing during active German proceedings is absurd. Burying one’s head does not negate settled expectations.

Finally, Petitioner’s Reply fails to address multiple issues raised in Patent Owner’s Discretionary Denial Brief, including the inadequacy of Apple’s *Sotera* Stipulation, the full effect of the European litigation, and the remaining overlap in efforts between the District Court litigation and the IPR. For all these additional reasons, discretionary denial should be granted.

Dated: December 24, 2025

Respectfully submitted,
/ Timothy Devlin /
Timothy Devlin, Reg. No. 41,706
DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC
1526 Gilpin Avenue
Wilmington, DE 19806
Phone: (302) 449-9010
Fax: (302) 353-4251
tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com

Attorney for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 24, 2025, I caused a true and correct copy of **PATENT OWNER'S REPLY TO DISCRETIONARY DENIAL** to be served via electronic mail on the following counsel for Petitioner:

LEAD COUNSEL	BACKUP COUNSEL
W. Karl Renner, Reg. No. 41,265 Fish & Richardson P.C. 60 South Sixth Street Suite 3200 Minneapolis, MN 55402 Tel: 202-783-5070 Fax: 877-769-7945 Email: IPR50095-0260IP1@fr.com	David Holt, Reg. No. 65,161 Nicholas Stephens, Reg. No. 74,320 Charlene Thrower, Reg. No. 79,289 Joseph Bauer, Reg. No. 81,218 Fish & Richardson P.C. 60 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 Tel: 202-783-5070 Fax: 877-769-7945 Email: IPR50095-0260IP1@fr.com

/ Timothy Devlin /
Timothy Devlin