

NEW YORK
SAN FRANCISCO
WASHINGTON, DCTamir Packin
New York
Direct: 212-351-3403
tpackin@desmaraisllp.com

October 15, 2025

Via EmailElizabeth Bernard
Daignault Iyer LLP
ebernard@daignaultiyer.com

Re: *Cisco Sys. Inc. v. Dynamic Mesh Networks, Inc. D/B/A Meshdynamics et al.*, Case No. 5:25-cv-06441-NW (N.D.CA.);
Dynamic Mesh Networks, Inc. D/B/A Meshdynamics v. Cisco Sys. Inc., Case No. 2:25-cv-00781-JRG (E.D.TX.)

Dear Elizabeth:

On behalf of Cisco Systems Inc. (“Cisco”) in the above-referenced cases (collectively the “Litigation”), we write regarding the following petitions for *inter partes* review (“IPR”) that Cisco filed with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”):

AIA Review Number	Challenged Patent	Challenged Claims
IPR2025-1304	U.S. Patent No. 7,885,243	1-7, 9-13
IPR2025-1523	U.S. Patent No. 7,420,952	1-21
IPR2025-1569	U.S. Patent No. 7,894,385	1-3
IPR2026-8	U.S. Patent No. 8,520,691	1, 9-11, 15-16, 18-19, 35

Consistent with *Sotera Wireless, Inc.*, Cisco—the Petitioner and the sole real-party-in-interest in the above captioned IPRs—hereby stipulates “that if the PTAB institutes *inter partes* review [and does not subsequently vacate institution], Petitioner ‘will not pursue in [the Litigation] the specific grounds [asserted in the instituted IPR], or . . . any other ground . . . that was raised or could have been reasonably raised in an IPR (i.e., any ground that could be raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patent or printed publications).” *Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.*, IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 at 13-14 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2020) (precedential).

Elizabeth Bernard

10/15/2025

Page 2

Very truly yours,

/s/ Tamir Packin

Tamir Packin

cc: Scott R. Samay (ssamay@daignaultiyer.com)
Jason S. Charkow (jcharkow@daignaultiyer.com)
Oded Burger (oburger@daignaultiyer.com)
Lisa Phillips (lphillips@daignaultiyer.com)
Peter Perkowski (peter@perkowskilegal.com)
Jennifer P. Ainsworth (jainsworth@wilsonlawfirm.com)