

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSARA INC.,
Petitioner

v.

MOTIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2026-00034
U.S. Patent No. 12,136,276

**PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S
REQUEST FOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL**

Mail Stop "PATENT BOARD"
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 2

III. THE EARLY CHALLENGE OF THE '276 PATENT FAVORS REVIEW..... 3

IV. THE *FINTIV* FACTORS FAVOR CONSIDERATION OF THE MERITS..... 4

 A. Factor 1 favors institution because there is evidence the district court will enter a stay if this IPR is instituted.4

 B. Factor 2 strongly favors institution because the Board will enter a Final Written Decision months before the district court trial.8

 C. Factor 3 strongly favors institution because there has been minimal investment, and Petitioner was diligent in filing this IPR.....10

 D. Factor 4 favors institution because Petitioner submitted a strong stipulation.11

 E. Factor 5 favors institution.11

 F. Factor 6 favors institution because the merits of the challenge are strong.12

V. THE OFFICE MADE A MATERIAL ERROR ISSUING THE '276 PATENT. 12

VI. THE PTAB IS THE MOST EFFICIENT FORUM TO DETERMINE VALIDITY OF THE '276 AND RELATED IPRS. 16

VII. THERE ARE NO OTHER REASONS FOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL..... 17

 A. Petitioner does not take any inconsistent claim construction positions.....17

 B. Patent Owner’s additional arguments for discretionary denial lack merit.....19

VIII. CONCLUSION..... 20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH,
IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 (PTAB Feb. 13, 2020).....14, 15

Anderson Power Prods., Inc. v. BizLink Tech., Inc.,
2025 WL 474906 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2025)5

Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.,
IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020).....*passim*

Berkshire Hathaway Energy Co. v. Birchtech Corp,
IPR2025-00274.....3

BOE Tech. Grp. Co., Ltd. v. Optronix Scis. LLC,
IPR2024-01130, Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 27, 2025)11

Caption Health, Inc. v. The University of British Columbia,
IPR2025-01422, Paper 15.....18

Embody, Inc. v. LifeNet Health,
IPR2025-00248, Paper 13 (PTAB. June 26, 2025) (Stewart)16

LBT IP II LLC v. Uber Techs. Inc.,
2023 WL 322894 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 19, 2023).....6

Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Stellar, LLC,
IPR2024-01205, Paper 19 (PTAB. Mar. 28, 2025) (Stewart).....11

NVIDIA Corp. v. Invensas Corp.,
IPR2020-00603, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 3, 2020).....11

OnePlus Tech. (Shenzhen) Co. v. Pantech Corp.,
IPR2025-00756, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 3, 2025).....3, 16

Padagis US LLC v. Neurelis, Inc.,
IPR2025-00464, Paper 12 (PTAB July 16, 2025).....12

Revvo Tech. v. Cerebrum Sensor Tech., Inc.,
IPR2025-00632, Paper 20 (PTAB Nov. 3, 2025).....17, 18

Samsung Elect. Co., Ltd. v. KP Innovations 2, LLC,
IPR2025-00101, Paper 13 (PTAB May 12, 2025)8

Shenzen Tuozhu Tech. Co. v. Stratasys, Inc.,
IPR2025-004383

SmartSky Networks LLC v. Gogo Business Aviation LLC,
IPR2025-00672, Paper 10 (PTAB July 31, 2025) (Stewart)8

Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.,
IPR202-01019, Paper 12 (PTAB Dec. 1, 2020)11

Straumann USA, LLC v. Smart Denture Conversions, LLC,
IPR2025-00956, Paper 11 (PTAB Sept. 19, 2025).....3

Sun Pharms. Indus. Inc. v. Nivagen Pharms.,Inc.,
IPR2025-00893, Paper 18 (PTAB Sept. 19, 2025) (Stewart).....17

Other Authorities

H.R. Rep. No. 112-98 (2011).....19

PETITIONER'S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 12,136,276 (Hassan)
1002	Prosecution History of U.S. Patent No. 12,136,276
1003	Declaration of Dr. Trevor Darrell
1004	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Dr. Trevor Darrell
1005	U.S. Publication No. 2020/0410704 (Choe)
1006	Prosecution History Figures of U.S. Publication No. 2020/0410704 to Choe
1007	U.S. Publication No. 2014/0240500 (Davies)
1008	International Publication No. WO2019/175286 (Westmacot)
1009	U.S. Publication No. 2022/0019829 (Tal)
1010	International Publication No. WO2009/027090 (Kuehnle)
1011	U.S. Publication No. 2019/0034740 (Kwant1)
1012	U.S. Publication No. 2019/0102674 (Kwant2)
1013	<i>Motive Techs., Inc. v. Samsara Inc.</i> , No. 24-cv-00902, Complaint (NDCA July 9, 2025)
1014	Russell, B.C. & Torralba, A., "Building a database of 3D scenes from user annotations," <i>2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition</i> , pp. 2711-2718 (2009)
1015	Bartl, V. & Herout, A., "Fully Automatic Horizon Estimation for Surveillance Cameras," <i>2017 International Conference on Digital Image Computing: Techniques and Applications (DICTA)</i> , pp. 1-8 (2017)
1016	U.S. Patent No. 9,201,421 to Fairfield et al.
1017	Chinese Publication No. 112509054 to Chongqing, including certified English-language translation
1018	Geiger, A., et al., "Vision Meets Robotics: The KITTI Dataset," <i>Int'l J. Robotics Res.</i> , 32(11):1231-1237 (Sept. 2013)

Exhibit	Description
1019	Cordts, M., et al., “The Cityscapes Dataset for Semantic Urban Scene Understanding,” <i>2016 IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition (CVPR)</i> , 3213-3223 (2016)
1020	Kato, S., et al., “Autoware on Board: Enabling Autonomous Vehicles with Embedded Systems,” <i>Proc. 2018 ACM/IEEE Int’l Conf. on Cyber-Physical Systems</i> , pp. 287-296 (April 2018)
1021	U.S. Patent No. 8,769,396 to Chen et al.
1022	Graf, G., et al., “The Predictive Corridor: A Virtual Augmented Driving Assistance System for Teleoperated Autonomous Vehicles,” <i>International Conference on Artificial Reality and Telexistence Eurographics Symposium on Virtual Environments</i> , pp. 61-69 (2020)
1023	U.S. Patent No. 5,652,849 to Conway et al.
1024	U.S. Patent No. 9,775,682 to Quaid et al.
1025	U.S. Patent No. 9,916,703 to Levinson et al.
1026	Waymo Safety Report: On the Road to Fully Self-Driving (Feb. 2021)
1027	Huang, X., et al., “The ApolloScape Open Dataset for Autonomous Driving and Its Application to Network Benchmarking,” <i>Proc. IEEE CVPR Workshops</i> (2018)
1028	U.S. Patent No. 9,905,949 to Hartmann
1029	Saparia, S., et al., “Active Safety System for Semi-Autonomous Teleoperated Vehicles,” <i>IEEE</i> (2021)
1030	U.S. Patent No. 10,027,031 to Arai et al.
1031	Liu, S., et al., “Edge Computing for Autonomous Driving: Opportunities and Challenges,” <i>IEEE</i> , (99):1-20 (2019)
1032	U.S. Patent No. 9,792,569 to Ikawa
1033	Lee, J., et al., “Online Extrinsic Camera Calibration Using Lane Boundary Observations,” pp. 1-6 (2020)
1034	Lee, J., et al., “CTRL-C: Camera Calibration Transformer With Line-Classification,” <i>Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Int’l Conf. on Computer Vision</i> , pp. 1-14 (2021)

Exhibit	Description
1035	Andrés M. Lopez et al., <i>Deep Single Image Camera Calibration With Radial Distortion</i> , in <i>Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition</i> 9290 (2019)
1036	Alex Davies, <i>Nissan’s Path to Self-Driving Cars? Humans in Call Centers</i> , WIRED (Jan. 5, 2017), https://www.wired.com/2017/01/nissans-self-driving-teleoperation/
1037	Aarian Marshall, <i>Self-Driving Cars Have a Secret Weapon: Remote Control</i> , WIRED (Feb. 1, 2018), https://www.wired.com/story/phantom-teleops/
1038	Andreas Geiger, Philip Lenz & Raquel Urtasun, <i>Are We Ready for Autonomous Driving? The KITTI Vision Benchmark Suite</i> , in 2012 IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition (CVPR) 3354 (2012), http://www.cvlibs.net/publications/Geiger2012CVPR.pdf
1039	<i>The KITTI Vision Benchmark Suite—Road/Lane Detection Evaluation</i> , CVlibs (dataset site), http://www.cvlibs.net/datasets/kitti/eval_road.php
1040	<i>The KITTI Vision Benchmark Suite</i> (home page), CVlibs, https://www.cvlibs.net/datasets/kitti/
1041	<i>The Cityscapes Dataset</i> , Cityscapes (dataset site), https://www.cityscapes-dataset.com/
1042	U.S. Dep’t of Transp., Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin., <i>Assessment of Safety Standards for Automotive Electronic Control Systems</i> (2016), https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/812285_electronicsreliabilityreport.pdf
1043	J. Brewer et al., <i>Functional Safety Assessment of a Generic Automated Lane Centering System and Related Foundational Vehicle Systems</i> (Volpe Nat’l Transp. Sys. Ctr. & NHTSA, Rep. No. DOT HS 812 572, Aug. 2018), https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/documents/13496_812572_alcsynthesis_080318.pdf
1044	Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin., <i>Human Factors Evaluation of Level 2 and Level 3 Automated Driving Concepts</i> (DOT HS 812 182, Aug. 2015),

Exhibit	Description
	https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/812182_humanfactorseval-1213-automdrivingconcepts.pdf
1045	Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin., Human Factors Design Guidance for Level 2 and Level 3 Automated Driving Concepts (DOT HS 812 555, Aug. 2018), https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/documents/13494_812555_1213automationhfguidance.pdf
1046	U.S. Dep’t of Transp. & Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin., Federal Automated Vehicles Policy: Accelerating the Next Revolution in Roadway Safety (Sept. 2016), https://www.transportation.gov/AV/federal-automated-vehicles-policy-september-2016
1047	Aarian Marshall, <i>Sacramento Eases Into the Self-Driving Scene</i> , WIRED (Aug. 1, 2018), https://www.wired.com/story/sacramento-phantom-auto-self-driving-car-partnership/
1048	Apollo, Dreamview Plus: README (2020), https://apollo.baidu.com/docs/apollo/9.x/md_modules_2dreamview_plus_2README.html
1049	Cruise, Webviz (2019), https://webviz.io ; https://web.archive.org/web/20191229152903/https://webviz.io/
1050	Cruise, Webviz GitHub Repository (2019), https://github.com/cruise-automation/webviz
1051	Kirsten Korosec, <i>Cruise Is Sharing Its Data Visualization Tool with Robotics Geeks Everywhere</i> , TechCrunch (June 18, 2019), https://techcrunch.com/2019/06/18/cruise-is-sharing-its-data-visualization-tool-with-robotics-geeks-everywhere
1052	Robot Web Tools, https://robotwebtools.github.io
1053	Amazon Web Servs., Inc., Amazon QuickSight—Fast, Easy Business Analytics for the Cloud, https://aws.amazon.com/quicksight ; https://web.archive.org/web/20151118211525/https://aws.amazon.com/quicksight/
1054	U.S. Patent No. 7,650,210 to Breed
1055	U.S. Publication No. 2013/0246135 to Wang

Exhibit	Description
1056	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2017/0010106 to Shashua
1057	U.S. Patent No. 9,665,100 to Shashua
1058	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2016/0214533 to Doyle
1059	U.S. Patent No. 8,612,136 to Levine
1060	Emami, Yousef, et al. “Human-in-the-loop machine learning for safe and ethical autonomous vehicles: Principles, challenges, and opportunities.” <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12548</i> (2024).
1061	Chen, Qi, et al. “F-cooper: Feature based cooperative perception for autonomous vehicle edge computing system using 3D point clouds.” <i>Proceedings of the 4th ACM/IEEE Symposium on Edge Computing</i> . 2019.
1062	Xu, Jiaxuan, et al. “An automated learning-based procedure for large-scale vehicle dynamics modeling on baidu apollo platform.” <i>2019 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)</i> . IEEE, 2019.
1063	Jiang, Shu, et al. “DRF: A framework for high-accuracy autonomous driving vehicle modeling.” <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.00646</i> (2020).
1064	Tang, Jie, et al. “LoPECS: A low-power edge computing system for real-time autonomous driving services.” <i>IEEE Access</i> 8 (2020): 30467-30479.
1065	Motion Success Statistics (Judge Donato), Docket Navigator, accessed at https://search.docketnavigator.com/patent/binder/0/0?print=true
1066	Samsara Inc.’s Reply in Support of Its Motion for Stay, <i>Motive Techs., Inc. v. Samsara Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:24-cv-00902 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 24, 2025)
1067	Motive’s Rule 26(A)(1) Initial Disclosures, <i>Motive Techs., Inc. v. Samsara Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:24-cv-00902 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2025)
1068	Joint Proposed Case Schedule, <i>Motive Techs., Inc. v. Samsara Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:24-cv-00902 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 2025)
1069	Plaintiff Motive’s Motion For Leave To File A Second Amended Complaint, <i>Motive Techs., Inc. v. Samsara Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:24-cv-00902 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2025)

Exhibit	Description
1070	Declaration Of David S. Bloch in Support of Motive’s Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint, <i>Motive Techs., Inc. v. Samsara Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:24-cv-00902 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2025)
1071	Institution Decision, <i>Samsara Inc. v. Motive Techs., Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00574 (PTAB Aug. 27, 2025)
1072	Joint Claim Construction, <i>Motive Techs., Inc. v. Samsara Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:24-cv-00902 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 15, 2026)
1073	Order Granting Motive’s Motion to Amend Complaint, <i>Motive Techs., Inc. v. Samsara Inc.</i> , Case No. 3:24-cv-00902 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2025)
1074	Complaint, <i>Samsara Inc. v. Motive Techs., Inc.</i> , Case No. 1-24-cv-00084 (D. Del. Jan. 24, 2024)
1075	Order Staying Proceeding, <i>Global Touch Solutions, LLC v. Toshiba Corporation</i> , Case No. 3:15-cv-02746 (N.D. Cal. April 7, 2016)
1076	Initial Determination, <i>Certain Vehicle Telematics, Fleet Management, and Videobased Safety Systems, Devices, And Components Thereof</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-1393 (ITC Sept. 8, 2025)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Director should decline to exercise discretion to deny institution of this *inter partes* review (IPR) Petition because it is an early challenge, Patent Owner does not have settled expectations, and the Final Written Decision will issue long before trial. The Office also made several material errors in allowing U.S. Patent No. 12,136,276 (“the ’276 patent”). For instance, the claims were rejected for double patenting over parent patent U.S. Patent No. 11,875,580 (“the ’580 patent”) (currently at Petitioner Reply stage in IPR2025-00574), and then inexplicably allowed the patent despite the Notice of Allowance specifically finding that all claimed features are taught by the prior art. Additionally, the examiner overlooked key disclosures of a reference cited in an IDS. Finally, the PTAB instituted review of the ’580 patent IPR, which the Office observed has similar claims. That instituted IPR is based on the same references used in challenges presented in this IPR. In the end, the PTAB is thus the most efficient—and fastest—forum to address the challenges to the ’276 patent, as they are already addressing challenges to the similar ’580 patent. Discretionary considerations strongly favor referral for a decision on the merits, and this IPR warrants institution for the reasons set forth in the Petition.

II. BACKGROUND

Samsara (Petitioner) was founded in California in 2015 by two computer science graduates of MIT, who have been recognized as technology pioneers. These founders used their unique technical backgrounds and experience to innovate for important sectors of their economy, like transportation and infrastructure, that were left behind by the digital transformation. Since Samsara's founding, the company has been a disruptor in fleet management and driver safety technology. As a result of Samsara's technology, customers can enhance the safety, efficiency, and sustainability of their operations.

In contrast to Samsara's innovative technology, Motive's original business was based on a simple known device to record a commercial driver's driving time. As Samsara's business sky-rocketed, Motive (Patent Owner) began copying Samsara's products. EX1074, 6; *see also* EX1076, 242 (ITC's initial determination finding that "it was Motive's intent to copy Samsara's products."). To stop Motive's rampant infringement, among other causes of action, Samsara filed suit in the District of Delaware and in the ITC. Motive then filed a retaliatory suit in the Northern District of California, asserting the '580 patent on unrelated technology against Samsara. Samsara filed an IPR challenge against this patent (the '580 patent) and the Board instituted review on August 27, 2025. EX1071.

On July 9, 2025, 17 months after Motive’s original complaint was filed in the Northern District of California, the District Court granted Patent Owner’s request to amend its complaint to add two additional patents: the ’276 patent challenged here (which, again, is a continuation of the ’580 patent) and U.S. Patent No. 12,062,243 (challenged in IPR2026-00108). EX1073. Samsara promptly filed IPR challenges to both patents within a few months of their late addition to the district court litigation.

III. THE EARLY CHALLENGE OF THE ’276 PATENT FAVORS REVIEW.

“Early challenges to patents favor robust, predictable patent rights and weigh against discretionary denial.” *Straumann USA, LLC v. Smart Denture Conversions, LLC*, IPR2025-00956, Paper 11 at 2 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 19, 2025).

The ’276 patent issued on November 5, 2024, and was in force less than one year at the time of the Petition’s filing on October 17, 2025. Challenges to patents that have been in force for less than six years are considered “early challenges” because patent owners typically have not developed settled expectations within this timeframe. *See, e.g., OnePlus Tech. (Shenzhen) Co. v. Pantech Corp.*, IPR2025-00756, Paper 11 at 2 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 3, 2025); *Berkshire Hathaway Energy Co. v. Birchtech Corp.*, IPR2025-00274 et al., Paper 23 at 3 (P.T.A.B. July 2, 2025); *Shenzen Tuozhu Tech. Co. v. Stratasys, Inc.*, IPR2025-00438 et al., Paper 10 at 2 (P.T.A.B. July 17, 2025).

The early challenge here favors consideration of the merits by the Director.

IV. THE *FINTIV* FACTORS FAVOR CONSIDERATION OF THE MERITS.

All of the discretionary factors under *Fintiv* strongly weigh in favor of consideration of the merits. *See Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 at 5-6 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential) (“*Fintiv*”).

A. Factor 1 favors institution because there is evidence the district court will enter a stay if this IPR is instituted.

Petitioner filed a motion to stay of all of Patent Owner’s infringement claims in the parallel NDCA district court proceeding, including the ’276 claims at issue here. EX2003. Factor 1 weighs in favor of consideration of the merits because the district court is highly likely to grant the requested stay. Indeed, in the past four years Judge Donato (the assigned judge in the parallel proceeding) has granted *all* of the motions to stay pending an *inter partes* review. EX1065.

Indeed, all three of the factors analyzed by the district court in considering a motion to stay favor granting the motion. EX2003; EX1066. Under the first stay factor, a stay will significantly streamline the issues presented in the district court. EX2003, 4-8; EX1066, 1-4. Petitioner has submitted IPRs challenging all three of the patents asserted by Patent Owner in the district court proceeding. As noted, one is already in trial at the Petitioner Reply stage, which has similar claims and

presents similar challenges. And the '276 and '243 patent IPR challenges are strong on the merits.

The second stay factor also supports the grant of a stay because the case is in the early stages, with the Markman hearing not scheduled until April 16, 2026, and trial set more than 19 months from now (on August 30, 2027); the NDCA has found this timing favors a stay. EX2003, 8; EX1066, 6-8. And under the third stay factor, a stay will not unduly prejudice Patent Owner, particularly as Petitioner diligently filed this IPR and the '243 patent IPR within a few months of Patent Owner's amendment of the complaint to include the '276 patent and '243 patent and filed its stay motion within a week after the '243 patent IPR was filed. EX2003, 8-10; EX1066, 8-10.

As discussed above, Judge Donato has not denied a stay of a patent claim pending an IPR in the past four years. Indeed, Judge Donato granted a stay in a similar situation as here in which PTAB had instituted some patents and another institution decision remained pending. EX1075. Patent Owner's arguments regarding why it would deviate from this practice are without merit and ignore the relevant stay factors. *First*, Patent Owner's argument that the scheduling order dates are firm, DD Br., 8-9, has no bearing on whether the stay will be granted. *Second*, Patent Owner is flatly wrong when it asserts that the partial stay of its infringement claims will not meaningfully streamline the parallel litigation and that

there is no evidence the NDCA will partially stay a case when other causes of action will move forward. *Contra* DD. Br., 9-11. The NDCA has rejected the “all-or-nothing” view and found the inquiry is “simplification, not elimination” of the issues. EX1066, 4 (citing *LBT IP II LLC v. Uber Techs. Inc.*, 2023 WL 322894, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 19, 2023); *Anderson Power Prods., Inc. v. BizLink Tech., Inc.*, 2025 WL 474906, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2025)). Furthermore, the NDCA has indeed granted a partial stay of a plaintiff’s patent claims pending the PTAB’s decision on institution, when other causes of action (including patent claims asserted by the defendant and trade secret claims) moved forward. *See Delphix Corp. v. Actifio, Inc.*, No. 5-13-cv-04613, Dkt. No. 118 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2014). And although Patent Owner alleges there will be overlapping witnesses, DD Br., 10—citing, as support, only a declaration from its *IPR counsel* (who has not appeared in the District Court)—the specific issues and technology involved in Patent Owner’s infringement case are distinct from the rest of the NDCA litigation. EX1066, 3-4. And, in its initial disclosures, Patent Owner identifies only *one* overlapping subject matter for witness testimony (*Petitioner’s* employee(s) having information on *Petitioner’s* revenue related to both parties’ claimed damages) and does not identify any single specific employee who will have testimony on the patent and non-patent causes of action. EX1067, 4.

Third, Patent Owner is again wrong when it alleges the parties' competitor relationship will result in the denial of the stay—this is only a subfactor of the prejudice factor and will not change the overall balance when all other subfactors weigh in favor of a stay. EX1066, 9-10. Last, rather than considering the case too advanced to issue a stay, DD Br., 12, the NDCA has routinely granted a stay in cases where there has not been a claim construction order, and expert discovery and dispositive motion practice has not occurred. EX1066, 6-7. To be sure, Patent Owner argued the case was in its early stages when it sought to amend its complaint to add the '276 patent to the District Court case last summer. EX1066, 7.

The cases cited by Patent Owner in support of its flawed position, DD. Br., 10-11, are readily distinguishable. EX1066, 4. In *SpaceData Corp. v. Alphabet Inc.*, the court had issued a Markman order, trial was only five months away, and the defendant had moved to stay only one of plaintiff's patent infringement claims. 2019 WL 1131420, at *1-*3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2019). The remaining two cases are from a different jurisdiction and have different facts than here.

In *Imax Corp. v. In-Three, Inc.*, the stay requested was pending reexamination and the court noted "the reexamination process takes a long time," and found the number of issues that will remain unresolved—given the lengthy timing and statistical unlikelihood that all claims would be eliminated—did not justify a stay. 385 F.Supp.2d 1030, 1032-1033 n.2 (C.D. Cal. Jul. 29, 2005). In

Fulfilium, Inc. v. ReShape Medical, LLC, the PTAB had not yet instituted an IPR and the defendant moved to stay the entire case, including the non-patent causes of action; the motion was denied because the IPRs would not impact the non-patent causes of action. 2018 WL 9848044, at *2 (C.D. Cal. June 4, 2018) (vacated on other grounds).

Because the NDCA is highly likely to grant a stay, this factor weighs strongly in favor of the Director considering the merits of this IPR.

B. Factor 2 strongly favors institution because the Board will enter a Final Written Decision months before the district court trial.

Factor 2 strongly weighs in favor of consideration of the merits. The projected statutory deadline for issuing a Final Written Decision (FWD) in this IPR is April 23, 2027. In the parallel NDCA district court litigation, trial is scheduled for August 30, 2027. EX2002, 3. Thus, the Board will likely issue its FWD *four months before* the district court trial.

In support of its flawed position that this factor favors denial, Patent Owner grossly mischaracterizes two cases that do *not* support its argument. *Contra* DD. Br., 14. In *SmartSky*, the Acting Director weighed *against* discretionary denial that the trial date was projected to occur months after the FWD because it reduced “the chances of duplication of efforts and inconsistent outcomes.” *SmartSky Networks LLC v. Gogo Business Aviation LLC*, IPR2025-00672, Paper 10 at 2 (PTAB July 31, 2025) (Stewart). Unlike the early challenge presented in this IPR, the reason

for the discretionary denial in *SmartSky* was because the challenged patent was in force for seven years, creating strong settled expectations for Patent Owner. *See id.*

Patent Owner's mischaracterization of *Samsung* is even worse : rather than "granting request for discretionary denial," as Patent Owner wrongly asserts, DD Br., 14, the panel denied institution for efficiency reasons because Petitioner failed to show a reasonable likelihood of prevailing on three of four grounds. *See Samsung Elecs. Co. v. KP Innovations 2, LLC*, IPR2025-00101, Paper 13 at 27-28 (PTAB May 12, 2025). There was no mention of *Fintiv* in the majority opinion (and the dissent would have instituted). *See id.*

Last, Patent Owner notes the FWD may be extended by good cause and will not become binding until the time to appeal has passed and any appeal of the FWD is resolved. DD. Br., 13. Patent Owner cites no case law for its assertion that either of these dates are relevant to the analysis, nor can it, because the relevant consideration is the proximity of the trial date to the Board's projected FWD date—as articulated in the precedential *Fintiv* decision and numerous Director decisions applying it. *See Fintiv*, 9. Furthermore, it is entirely speculative that there will be any good cause shown for an extension of the FWD and that there will be an appeal to the Federal Circuit.

Because the NDCA trial date is four months after the projected FWD date (which is undisputed), this factor weighs strongly in favor of merits consideration.

C. Factor 3 strongly favors institution because there has been minimal investment, and Petitioner was diligent in filing this IPR.

Factor 3 favors institution because the parties and the court have not made significant investment in the NDCA litigation and Petitioner was diligent in filing this IPR.

The district court case is in the early stages, with invalidity contentions only recently exchanged, opening claim construction briefs not due until March 5, 2026, the deadline for non-expert document production six months away, and expert discovery cut-off ten months away. EX2002. Even in the unlikely event this case is not stayed, the court will not have issued a *Markman* order by the institution date because the hearing is scheduled to occur mere days before. *Cf. Fintiv*, 9-10 (explaining that the issuance of “district court claim construction orders may indicate that the court and parties have invested sufficient time in the parallel proceeding to favor denial”).

Indeed, Patent Owner argued that the district court was in the early stages when it sought (and was granted) leave to add the '276 and '243 patents to the district court case. EX1068, 1; EX1069, 6; EX1070, ¶8. Patent Owner should not be permitted to have it both ways—arguing the litigation in district court was in its early stages in order to amend its complaint, and then claiming that the district court case is too far advanced in an IPR petition filed just a few months later (with minimal case activity in between).

Further, Petitioner filed this IPR expeditiously—a mere 3 months after Patent Owner amended its complaint on July 9, 2025, to assert the '276 patent. EX2007. The minimal investment and Petitioner's diligence weigh in favor of referral for consideration of the merits. *Fintiv*, 10-12.

D. Factor 4 favors institution because Petitioner submitted a strong stipulation.

Factor 4 favors consideration of the merits. Petitioner filed a strong stipulation that if the Board institutes this IPR, Petitioner will not raise in district court “any grounds raised or that reasonably could have been raised in the Petition or any grounds that are combinations of the prior art asserted in this IPR with unpublished system prior art.” Paper 6, 1. The stipulation was timely filed more than a month before Patent Owner's Discretionary Denial Brief, and, therefore, Patent Owner's arguments on overlap, DD. Br., 15, should be disregarded because they ignore the stipulation. *Id.* To be sure, Petitioner's strong stipulation mitigates concerns of duplication of effort and concerns of potentially conflicting decisions. *Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.*, IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 at 19 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 1, 2020) (precedential as to § II.A); *Motorola Sol'ns, Inc. v. Stellar, LLC*, IPR2024-01205, Paper 19 at 4 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 28, 2025) (Stewart).

E. Factor 5 favors institution.

This factor weighs in favor of referral for consideration of the merits because the parties in the parallel litigation are the same and the Board will reach

its determination before the district court. *See BOE Tech. Grp. Co. v. Optronix Scis. LLC*, IPR2024-01130, Paper 16 at 13 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 27, 2025) (noting weight of factor 5 depends on which tribunal is likely to reach a decision first); *NVIDIA Corp. v. Invensas Corp.*, IPR2020-00603, Paper 11 at 23 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 3, 2020) (factor 5 weighs against denial where Board is likely to reach a FWD first).

F. Factor 6 favors institution because the merits of the challenge are strong.

The Office made a material error in issuing the '276 patent. *See* Section V. The Petition presents strong challenges based on prior art that the Examiner should have considered but did not. Indeed, in the '580 patent IPR, the Board has already instituted review of the parent application to the '276 patent based on the Choe and Westmacot references, the same primary references used in the present Petition, which collectively show all claims unpatentable. *Compare* Pet., 5, *with* IPR2025-00574 ('580 patent IPR), Pet. at 10. Accordingly, this factor weighs in favor of consideration of the merits.

In sum, all six of the *Fintiv* factors weigh in favor of the Director considering the Petition's merits.

V. THE OFFICE MADE A MATERIAL ERROR ISSUING THE '276 PATENT.

The Director should consider the Petition on the merits and institute review to correct the material error made by the Office in issuing the '276 patent. *See*

Padagis US LLC v. Neurelis, Inc., IPR2025-00464, Paper 12 at 3 (PTAB July 16, 2025) (informative) (determining it is an appropriate use of Office resources to review a material error by the Office). There are at least three clear errors presented here that warrant institution.

First, during prosecution, the Examiner issued only a single Office Action, rejecting the claims as obvious over Kwant1 and Kwant2 and for non-statutory double patenting. EX1002, 0119, 0122. In response, Applicant filed a terminal disclaimer and merely argued the claims were allowable over the references but did not amend the claims. EX1002, 0137-39. The Examiner subsequently issued a Notice of Allowance with contradictory information that indicates both that the prior art discloses all limitations and that the prior art fails to disclose certain limitations. *Compare* EX1002, 0175-76, *with id.*, 176-177. A summary of the findings in the Notice of Allowance that the prior art discloses claimed limitations (contradicting the reasons for allowance) is listed in the table below:

Limitation	Examiner’s findings that limitation is disclosed in prior art:
“detecting a horizon line in the image”	Kwant1, Abstract
“overlaying a line in the image to generate an overlaid image”	Kwant 1, Fig. 4 401A-C
“transmitting the overlaid image to a computing device over a network”	Kwant 1, Fig. 1, 100, Fig. 6 Step 607, ¶71
“receiving a modification of the line from the computing device, the modification comprising a new line at a second position”	Kwant 2, ¶51
“computing a camera parameter based on the new line”	Kwant 2
“transmitting data representing the camera parameter to the camera device”	Kwant 2, Fig. 8a

EX1002, 0175-76. Applicant did not seek to correct the Notice of Allowance by filing an after-allowance amendment. Thus, the findings in the Notice of Allowance that indicate the prior art discloses all elements of the allowed independent claims remain undisputed. Institution of this IPR is warranted to correct the error made by the Office in allowing a patent where the Notice of Allowance indicates all elements of the issued independent claims are disclosed in the prior art, and the claims are therefore not allowable in the first place.

Second, the ’276 patent claims are similar to its parent claims—claims the Board already found a reasonable likelihood are unpatentable when it instituted review in the ’580 patent IPR. EX1071. This petition presents challenges based on the same primary reference (Choe) and Westmacot. *Compare* Pet., 5, with IPR2025-00574 (’580 patent IPR), Pet. at 10. The Director should institute review

here to review the similar material error in allowing the '276 claims over prior art (Choe, Davis, Kuehnle, Westmacot, Tal) that should have been found and considered during prosecution.

Third, the Office committed material error by overlooking key disclosures in Westmacot that should have been applied during prosecution to reject the claims. Although Westmacot was cited to the Office via an information disclosure statement, the Examiner did not issue any rejections based on Westmacot or otherwise indicate understanding of Westmacot's relevance. Under part two of the *Advanced Bionics* framework, the Office erred in a manner material to patentability by failing to reject the claims over Westmacot. *See Advanced Bionics, LLC v. Med-El Elektromedizinische Geräte GmbH*, IPR2019-01469, Paper 6 at 8-9 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 13, 2020) (precedential). Indeed, the Petition explains in detail that Westmacot alone discloses the preamble and claim limitations 1A, 1B, and 1C. Pet., 60-64, 79. The remaining trivial limitations of the independent claims related to transmitting, receiving, and sharing information over a network are taught by Westmacot in combination with Tal—a combination not considered by the Examiner. *See* Pet., 65-72. All dependent claims are also taught by Westmacot, alone or in combination with Tal. Pet., 73-79. The Director should institute review of the IPR to address this material error.

VI. THE PTAB IS THE MOST EFFICIENT FORUM TO DETERMINE VALIDITY OF THE '276 AND RELATED IPRS.

PTAB is the most efficient forum to address all of the patents asserted by Patent Owner in the parallel district court litigation. Petitioner has filed IPR challenges for all three of the patents. One has already been instituted, and the remaining two challenges (including the challenge to '276 here) are strong challenges with favorable discretionary considerations. The status of each IPR, and key factors relevant to discretion, is summarized in the chart below:

Patent (IPR)	IPR Institution Status	Patent Issue Date	<i>Fintiv</i> factor 2
11,875,580 (IPR2025-00574)	Instituted Aug. 27, 2025	January 26, 2024	FWD > 1 year before trial
12,136,276 (IPR2026-00034)	Pending	November 5, 2024	FWD > 4 months before trial
12,062,243 (IPR2026-00108)	Pending	August 13, 2024	FWD > 3 months before trial

As illustrated by the chart, discretionary considerations for both this IPR and the '243 patent IPR favor consideration of the merits. Petitioner's challenges are "early challenges, which weighs against discretionary denial. *See e.g., OnePlus Tech.*, Paper 11 at 2. Further, Petitioner promptly filed the last two IPRs within a few months of the Patent Owner's amendment of its district court complaint to add the '276 and '243 patents. Thus, despite the late addition of these patents to district court, the projected date for PTAB to issue its final written decision for both pending IPRs is months prior to the district court trial. This also weighs against

discretionary denial.

Additionally, as asserted by Patent Owner when it sought to amend its complaint, “all three patents are directed to similar technologies.” EX1069, 5. Indeed, the ’276 patent challenged here is a child of the ’580 patent and the same primary reference (Choe) is used in challenges in both proceedings. *Compare* Pet., 5, *with* IPR2025-00574 (’580 patent IPR), Pet. at 10. Given the overlap in technologies, it would be more efficient for PTAB to consider all three challenges. *See e.g., Embody, Inc. v. LifeNet Health*, IPR2025-00248, Paper 13 at 3 (P.T.A.B. June 26, 2025) (Stewart) (it is an efficient use of Board resources to address related patents).

VII. THERE ARE NO OTHER REASONS FOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL.

All of the remaining considerations presented here weigh against discretionary denial.

A. Petitioner does not take any inconsistent claim construction positions.

Petitioner is mindful the Office instructed “when a petitioner takes alternative positions before the Board and district court, that petitioner should, at a minimum, explain why alternative positions are warranted.” *Revvo Tech. v. Cerebrum Sensor Tech., Inc.*, IPR2025-00632, Paper 20 at 3-4 (PTAB Nov. 3, 2025) (Squires) (precedential). Advancing a narrower claim construction in district

court than advanced at PTAB, without sufficient explanation, favors discretionary denial. *Sun Pharms. Indus. Inc. v. Nivagen Pharms., Inc.*, IPR2025-00893, Paper 18 at 3 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 19, 2025) (Stewart) (informative). This consideration has no bearing here because Petitioner does not advance any inconsistent, or narrower, constructions at district court than before the Board.

In its Petition, Samsara construed the terms “according to their ordinary and customary meanings as understood by a POSA in view of the specification.” Pet., 4. For clarity, related to potential issues that do not bear on this proceeding, Petitioner proposed claim constructions in district court for “camera parameter,” “an image of a roadway recorded by a camera device,” and the ordering of the steps of method claims 1, 8, and 15. EX1072, 2-3, 5-7. These constructions are not inconsistent, or narrower, than the ordinary and customary meaning. Regardless, to remove any perceived discrepancy, Petitioner stipulates to use before the Board the same construction that was expressly proposed in the district court. This stipulation “resolves any potential inconsistency in claim construction positions between forums and does not require further explanation under *Revvo.*” *Caption Health, Inc. v. The University of British Columbia*, IPR2025-01422, Paper 15 at 3 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 18, 2025) (Squires). Petitioner does not contend that any of the claims are indefinite, so there is no risk of inconsistency on that front either.

Accordingly, there are no inconsistent claim construction positions that weigh in favor of discretionary denial.

B. Patent Owner’s additional arguments for discretionary denial lack merit.

Patent Owner’s allegations of impropriety and gamesmanship are baseless.

Contra DD. Br., 2, 16.

Patent Owner alleges Petitioner is using this IPR to improperly “bolster its motion to stay” in district court. DD. Br, 16. This allegation is nonsensical and illogical. This IPR was filed, not to bolster a stay motion, but because Patent Owner amended its complaint to assert infringement of the ’276 patent and, as shown in the Petition, the claims are clearly unpatentable.

Furthermore, Patent Owner’s allegation, DD. Br., 2, 16, that Petitioner filed this IPR to engage in gamesmanship is patently false. Petitioner seeks to streamline the district court litigation and to avail itself of the intended benefits of *inter partes review* to “provid[e] a more efficient system for challenging patents” and to reduce litigation costs. H.R. Rep. No. 112-98 at 39-40 (2011). As discussed in Section VI, PTAB already instituted review of the ’580 parent patent (with similar claims to the ’276 patent) and would be the most efficient and fastest forum to resolve the patentability of the patents asserted by Patent Owner in district court.

VIII. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the Director should deny Patent Owner's request to discretionarily deny this IPR and should institute review of the challenged claims.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Jason D. Eisenberg/

Jason D. Eisenberg, Reg. No. 43,447
Lestin Kenton, Reg. No. 72,314
Tyler Dutton, Reg. No. 75,069
Jean Selep, Reg. No. 83,022
Counsel for Petitioner Samsara Inc.

Date: January 23, 2026

1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 371-2600

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e))

I certify that the above-captioned **PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL** and associated Exhibits 1065-1076 were served in their entireties on January 23, 2026, upon the following parties via electronic mail:

Vincent M. Ferraro (Lead Counsel)
Michael J. Zinna (Back-up Counsel)
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
vferraro@kelleydrye.com
mzinna@kelleydrye.com

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Jason D. Eisenberg/

Jason D. Eisenberg
Registration No. 43,447
Lead Attorney for Petitioner Samsara Inc.

Date: January 23, 2026

1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 371-2600