

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

AMAZON.COM SERVICES LLC
Petitioner,

v.

SMART SPEAKER LLC
Patent Owner.

Patent No. 11,190,590

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2026-00148

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THIS IPR IS AN APPROPRIATE USE OF OFFICE RESOURCES	2
A. Patent Owner Has No Settled Expectations	2
B. This IPR Will Allow the Office to Correct Material Errors During Prosecution.....	4
C. There Are Compelling Economic and Public Interest Reasons to Examine the Challenged Claims	6
D. This IPR Will Promote Efficiency And Prevent Serial Litigation	8
E. 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Does Not Apply	8
III. THE <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS WEIGH STRONGLY AGAINST DENIAL.....	9
A. Factor 1: Likelihood of Post-Institution Stay is Neutral	9
B. Factor 2: Weighs Against Denial - District Court Trial Will Occur <i>After</i> the FWD	10
C. Factor 3: Weighs Against Denial - Investment in the District Court Is Not “Substantial”	12
D. Factor 4: Sotera Stipulation Weighs Against Denial	13
E. Factor 5: Identity of the Parties Weighs Against Denial Because the FWD Is Likely to Precede the Trial	15
F. Factor 6: Other Considerations Weigh Strongly Against Discretionary Denial.....	15
1. The grounds are straightforward and compelling	15

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
2. Patent Owner fails to show “gap” filling	17
IV. CONCLUSION.....	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>3D Sys. Corp. v. Intrepid Automation, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-01241	18
<i>Apple Inc. v. Seven Networks, LLC</i> , IPR2020-00285, Paper 10, 31	8
<i>Apple Inc. v. Vampire Labs., LLC</i> , IPR2025-01215, Paper 2, 9 (Jun. 27, 2025)	17
<i>Apple Inc. v. Vampire Labs, LLC</i> , IPR2025-01215, Paper 8, 8-9 (Oct. 17, 2025).....	14
<i>Apple v. Fintiv</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11, 11	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bio-Rad Lab 'ys, Inc. v. Cal. Inst. of Tech.</i> , IPR2024-01451, Paper 11, 10 (PTAB Mar. 27, 2025).....	13
<i>BMW of N. Am., LLC v. Mich. Motor Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2023-01234, Paper 11, 14–15 (PTAB Jan. 26, 2024)	15
<i>BOE Tech. Grp. Co., Ltd, v. Optronix Scis., LLC</i> , IPR2024-01133, Paper 16, 9 (PTAB January 27, 2025)	9
<i>BOE Tech. Grp. Co. v. Optronix Scis. LLC</i> , IPR2024-01130, Paper 16, 10 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2025)	11
<i>Broadphone LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 2:23- CV-00001, 2024 WL 3524022 (E.D. Tex. July 24, 2024).....	9
<i>Cambridge Indus. USA, Inc., v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00434, Paper 11, 2 (PTAB, June 26, 2025)	18
<i>CLO Virtual Fashion Inc. v. Zhejiang Lingdi Digital Technology Co., Ltd.</i> , No. 2:23-cv-00274 (E.D. Tex. June 14, 2023)	11

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

<i>Foras Technologies Ltd. v. Aptiv PLC</i> , No. 2:23-CV-00314, 2024 WL 5348631 (E.D. Tex. July 25, 2024).....	9
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. Autoconnect Holdings LLC</i> , IPR2025-01383	18
<i>Google LLC v. Sandpiper CDN, LLC</i> , IPR2025-00969, Paper 8, 2 (Sep. 18, 2025).....	14
<i>Hanwha Sols. Corp., v. Maxeon Solar Pte. Ltd.</i> , IPR2024-01203, Paper 17, 12–13 (PTAB February 26, 2025)	9
<i>Headwater Rsch. LLC v. AT&T Inc.</i> , No. 2:23-cv-00397 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 1, 2023).....	11
<i>Hisense USA Corp. v. Light Guide Innovations LLC</i> , IPR2025-01526	17
<i>Hisense USA Corp. v. Light Guide Innovations LLC</i> , IPR2025-01537	17
<i>Home Depot USA Inc., v. H2 Intellect LLC</i> , IPR2025-00480, Paper 11, 2–3. No.....	2
<i>Intel Corp. v. Advanced Cluster Sys., Inc.</i> , IPR-2025-00913, Paper 13, 2	2
<i>Kubota N. Am. Corp. v. Vermeer Mfg. Co.</i> , IPR2025-00170, Paper 15, 13 (June 10, 2025).....	13
<i>Liberty Energy Servs. LLC v. U.S. Well Servs., LLC</i> , IPR2025-00139, Paper 14, 13–14 (June 11, 2025).....	13
<i>MIM Software Inc. v. Progenics Pharms., Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00630, Paper 13, 2.....	2, 3
<i>Motorola Sols., Inc. v. Stellar, LLC</i> , IPR2024-01205, Paper 19, 4 (PTAB Mar. 28, 2025).....	14
<i>PLR Worldwide Sales Ltd. v. Flip Phone Games, Inc.</i> , IPR2024-00171, Paper 9, 6 (PTAB May 10, 2024)	9

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Resonant Sys., Inc.,
IPR2023-00993, Paper 17, 24 (PTAB Jan. 10, 2024)15

SAP Am., Inc. v. Cyandia, Inc.,
IPR2024-01433, Paper 13, 9 (PTAB April 7, 2025)9

SoftView LLC v. Apple Inc.,
108 F.4th 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2024)8

Stingray Grp. Inc. v. Hernandez-Mondragon,
IPR2025-00349, Paper 19, 7–8 (June 13, 2025).....13

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 311(a)3

35 U.S.C. § 325(d)8, 9

Petitioner's Updated Exhibit List

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
U.S. Patent No. 11,190,590 to Binder <i>et al.</i>	1001
Expert Declaration of Dr. Henry Houh	1002
File History of U.S. Patent No. 11,190,590	1003
U.S. Pat. Publication No. 2010/0238003 to Chan <i>et al.</i>	1004
Korean Patent Pub. No. 20100083686 to Seo <i>et al.</i> – English Translation	1005
U.S. Patent No. 8,461,861 to Botts	1006
Paul Scherz, “Practical Electronics for Inventors” (2nd Edition, 2007).	1007
S. Middelhoek <i>et al.</i> , “Handbook of Sensors and Actuators: Measuring Current, Voltage and Power” (Elsevier, 1999).	1008
Declaration of Rachel J. Watters on the scanned copies of pages from Andrea Goldsmith, “Wireless Communications” (Cambridge University Press, 2005).	1009
Thomas D. Rossing <i>et al.</i> , “Springer Handbook of Acoustics” (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 2007).	1010
Jacob Benesty <i>et al.</i> , “Springer Handbook of Speech Processing” (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2008).	1011
Jacob Fraden, “Handbook of Modern Sensors” (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 2010)	1012
Jim Doherty <i>et al.</i> , “Wireless Home Networking Simplified” (Cisco Press, 2007).	1013
Emre Ozturk <i>et al.</i> , “Forced Air Cooling of CPUs with Heat Sinks: A Numerical Study” (IEEE Transactions on Components and Packaging Technologies, Vol. 31, No. 3, September 2008)	1014

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
(available at https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/4609939)	
Kuo, Yue. “Thin Film Transistor Technologies (TFTT VII): Proceedings of the International Symposium.” (Electrochemical Society, 2005).	1015
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of Ata Elahi and Adam Gschwender, “ZigBee Wireless Sensor and Control Network,” (Prentice Hall, 2009)	1016
U.S. Pat. Publication No. 2001/0025349 to Sharood <i>et al.</i>	1017
Frank Adelstein <i>et al.</i> , “Fundamentals of Mobile and Pervasive Computing” (McGraw-Hill, 2005).	1018
Jan Axelson, “Serial Port Complete: COM Ports, USB Virtual COM Ports, and Ports for Embedded Systems,” (2nd Edition, 2007).	1019
Ian Sinclair <i>et al.</i> , “Electronic and Electrical Servicing,” (Elsevier Limited, 2 nd Edition, 2007)	1020
U.S. Patent No. 8,340,975 to Rosenberger	1021
U.S. Patent No. 7,593,718 to Gorday <i>et al.</i>	1022
U.S. Pat. Publication No. 2006/00135067 to Dunko	1023
U.S. Patent No. 8,183,995 to Wang <i>et al.</i>	1024
P.A. Roberts <i>et al.</i> , “IP address management” (BT Technology Journal, Vol. 18, 2000) (available at https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1026749131441)	1025
U.S. Pat. Publication 2013/0099447 to Patton	1026
Robert J. Shimonski <i>et al.</i> , “Sniffer Pro Network Optimization and Troubleshooting Handbook” (Syngress Publishing, Inc., 2002).	1027

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
Korean Patent Pub. No. 20100083686 to Seo <i>et al.</i>	1028
Certification of Translation of Korean Patent Pub. No. 20100083686 to Seo <i>et al.</i>	1029
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of Paul Scherz, “Practical Electronics for Inventors” (2nd Edition, 2007).	1030
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of S. Middelhoek <i>et al.</i> , “Handbook of Sensors and Actuators: Measuring Current, Voltage and Power” (Elsevier, 1999).	1031
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of Thomas D. Rossing <i>et al.</i> , “Springer Handbook of Acoustics” (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 2007).	1032
Declaration of Catherine Vassilkova on the scanned copies of pages of Jacob Benesty <i>et al.</i> , “Springer Handbook of Speech Processing” (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2008).	1033
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of Jacob Fraden, “Handbook of Modern Sensors” (Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 2010)	1034
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of Jim Doherty <i>et al.</i> , “Wireless Home Networking Simplified” (Cisco Press, 2007).	1035
Declaration of Ziaad Khan on the scanned copies of pages of Emre Ozturk <i>et al.</i> , “Forced Air Cooling of CPUs with Heat Sinks: A Numerical Study” (IEEE Transactions on Components and Packaging Technologies, Vol. 31, No. 3, September 2008)	1036
Declaration of Ziaad Khan on the scanned copies of pages of Kuo, Yue. “Thin Film Transistor Technologies (TFTT VII): Proceedings of the International Symposium.” (Electrochemical Society, 2005).	1037

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of Appendix A of Frank Adelstein et al., “Fundamentals of Mobile and Pervasive Computing” (McGraw-Hill, 2005).	1038
Reserved	1039
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of Ian Sinclair <i>et al.</i> , “Electronic and Electrical Servicing,” (Elsevier Limited, 2 nd Edition, 2007)	1040
Declaration of Tony Corsini on the scanned copies of pages of P.A. Roberts <i>et al.</i> , “IP address management” (BT Technology Journal, Vol. 18, 2000) (available at https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1026749131441)	1041
U.S. Energy Information Administration, “How much electricity is used for home air conditioning in the United States?,” https://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.php?id=108&t=3&utm , EIA (accessed Nov. 11, 2025)	1042
<i>RD75613 – Jetlun Appliance Module User Guide</i> , Rev. 1.0 DRAFT (Jetlun Corporation)	1043
FCC database page for Jetlun <i>RD75613</i>	1044
International Publication No. WO 2011/106857 to Botega et al. – English Translation	1045
International Publication No. WO 2011/106857 to Botega et al.	1046
Certification of Translation of International Publication No. WO 2011/106857 to Botega et al. – English Translation	1047
U.S. Patent No. 8,200,798 to Yadav <i>et al.</i>	1048
International Publication No. WO 97/40621 to Wiedemann <i>et al.</i>	1049
U.S. Patent Pub. No. 20100149163 to Betts-LaCroix	1050

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2013/0052946 to Chatterjee <i>et al.</i>	1051
U.S. Patent No. 7,590,542 to Williams <i>et al.</i>	1052
Business Record Search for Smart Speaker LLC, dated December 16, 2025, with Secretary of State of Delaware	1053 [NEW]
Assignment from Yehuda Binder and Benjamin Maytal to May Patents Ltd., dated May 30, 2018, PTO Assignment Records	1054 [NEW]
Corrective Assignment from May Patents Ltd. to Smart Speaker LLC, dated June 2, 2025, PTO Assignment Records	1055 [NEW]
U.S. Provisional Application No. 61/584,500	1056 [NEW]
Samsung, “Samsung Shows Dedication to IoT with \$1.2 Billion Investment and R&D,” https://news.samsung.com/us/samsung-electronics-internet-of-things-planning-1-2-billion-for-u-s-research-and-development-of-iot/ , Samsung Newsroom U.S. (Jun. 21, 2016)	1057 [NEW]
IBM, “IBM Connects ‘Internet of Things’ to the Enterprise,” https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/ibm-connects-internet-of-things-to-the-enterprise-300058256.html , PR Newswire (Mar. 31, 2015)	1058 [NEW]
Issie Lapowsky, “Amazon Doubles Down on Gadgets in Battle with Google and Apple,” https://www.wired.com/2014/09/amazon-lab126/ , Wired (Sep. 24, 2014)	1059 [NEW]
Amazon.com, Inc., “Amazon Introduces the Alexa Fund: \$100 Million in Investments to Fuel Voice Technology Innovation,” https://press.aboutamazon.com/2015/6/amazon-introduces-the-alexa-fund-100-million-in-investments-to-fuel-voice-technology-innovation , Amazon Press Center (Jun. 25, 2015)	1060 [NEW]

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
Mary Ann Azevedo, “Venture Funding in IoT Startups Continues to Go Up,” https://news.crunchbase.com/startups/venture-funding-iot-startups-continues-go/ , Crunchbase News (Mar. 2, 2018)	1061 [NEW]
The White House Office of the Press Secretary, “FACT SHEET: Administration Announces New ‘Smart Cities’ Initiative to Help Communities Tackle Local Challenges and Improve City Services,” https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/14/fact-sheet-administration-announces-new-smart-cities-initiative-help , The White House Press Office (Sep. 14, 2015)	1062 [NEW]
The White House Office of the Press Secretary, “FACT SHEET: Announcing Over \$80 million in New Federal Investment and a Doubling of Participating Communities in the White House Smart Cities Initiative,” https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/09/26/fact-sheet-announcing-over-80-million-new-federal-investment-and , The White House Press Office (Sep. 26, 2016)	1063 [NEW]
Nick Ismail, “The impact of the Internet of Things,” https://www.information-age.com/impact-internet-things-iot-6848/ , Information Age (July 24, 2017)	1064 [NEW]
Michael Chui, et al., “IoT value set to accelerate through 2030: Where and how to capture it,” capabilities/tech-and-ai/our-insights/iot-value-set-to-accelerate-through-2030-where-and-how-to-capture-it , McKinsey (Nov.9, 2021)	1065 [NEW]
Holly Sullivan, “6 ways Amazon’s investments are helping the U.S. economy, from contributing over \$1 trillion to the GDP to creating jobs in small towns,” https://www.aboutamazon.com/news/job-creation-and-investment/amazon-economic-impact-report-2024 , Amazon News (Sep. 29, 2024)	1066 [NEW]
Lex Machina, Judge James Rodney Gilstrap, Time from Opening Motion to Order	1067

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
	[NEW]
U.S. District Court, Judicial Caseload Profile, Federal Court Median Time to Trial Statistics as of September 30, 2025, https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/document/fcms_na_disprofile0930_2025.pdf	1068 [NEW]
Lex Machina, Judge James Rodney Gilstrap, Case Filings Summary and Case Status	1069 [NEW]
M. Needham, “Smart Home Market on Track for Rebound Thanks to Emerging Regions, According to IDC,” https://my.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=prUS52632124 , IDC Research (Oct. 1, 2024)	1070 [NEW]
Continuity data for provisional application, USPTO	1071 [NEW]
<i>Network-1 Techs., Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-00667-JRG, (E.D. Tex. Oct. 10, 2025), ECF 26	1072 [NEW]
<i>Honeywell Int’l Inc. v. EPS – Ehrhardt + Partner Sols., Inc.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-00918, (E.D. Tex. Dec. 10, 2025), ECF 35	1073 [NEW]
<i>Motadata Corp. v. UAB Xirgo Glob.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-00660, (E.D. Tex. Oct. 8, 2025), ECF 20	1074 [NEW]
<i>Lubricote, LLC v. Lumenis Be Ltd.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-00650, (E.D. Tex. Dec. 10, 2025), ECF 21	1075 [NEW]
<i>Gumipod Grp. Ltd v. Altria Grp., Inc.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-00850-JRG-RSP, (E.D. Tex. Jan. 6, 2026), ECF 41	1076 [NEW]
<i>Intercurrency Software LLC v. Nium Pte. Ltd.</i> , No. 2:25-cv-00701-JRG, (E.D. Tex. Oct. 10, 2025), ECF 27	1077 [NEW]

IPR2026-00148

Patent No. 11,190,590

Exhibit Description	Exhibit #
Plaintiff's Responses and Objections to Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-16), <i>Smart Speaker LLC, v. Amazon.com Services LLC</i> , No. 2:25-cv-00707 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 28, 2026).	1078 [NEW]

I. INTRODUCTION

The Petition should be referred for merits consideration for the following reasons. *First*, there are no settled expectations because the '590 patent and the other patents-in-suit issued less than four and a half years ago and some just a few months ago:

Patent No.	Earliest Claimed Priority Date	Filing Date	Issue Date
11,128,710	1/9/2012	7/23/2017	9/21/2021
11,190,590	1/9/2012	5/30/2018	11/30/2021
12,010,174	1/9/2012	8/23/2021	6/11/2024
12,316,706	1/9/2012	5/28/2024	5/27/2025
12,401,720	1/9/2012	5/28/2025	8/26/2025
12,401,721	1/9/2012	5/28/2025	8/26/2025

Second, a series of Examiner errors pollute this and subsequent patents.

Third, there are compelling economic and public interests that demand review of the challenged claims: an attack on America's billion-dollar Internet of Things (IoT) economy. The applicant filed a kitchen-sink style provisional application on January 9, 2012, and filed several applications that were ultimately abandoned after prolonged prosecution. (EX1071; EX1056.) Six years later, it filed the '590 patent application in 2018. The patent issued in 2021, almost a decade after the earliest provisional was filed. In the meantime, IoT technology matured as U.S. companies, such as Amazon, spent millions on R&D to develop

and patent technologies, while the applicant remained on the sidelines, tailoring its claims to read on those innovations without developing any products.

Fourth, a review will promote efficiency as it will resolve current and potential future disputes that may stem from numerous pending applications.

Fifth, the *Fintiv* factors strongly weigh against discretionary denial. The scheduled trial date is *after* the anticipated Final Written Decision deadline. Time-to-trial statistics and Judge Gilstrap’s caseload suggest that the trial date will likely be delayed even further. The parallel litigation is in its early stages: claim construction briefing has not yet begun, no depositions have been taken, and the district court has not made any substantive rulings.

As discussed below, each of these reasons compels a merits consideration.

II. THIS IPR IS AN APPROPRIATE USE OF OFFICE RESOURCES

A. Patent Owner Has No Settled Expectations

The ’590 patent had been in force for less than four years before Amazon filed the petition for *inter partes* review. The Director has repeatedly found that patent owners do not have settled expectations for patents issued less than six years prior to a petition. *See e.g., Intel Corp. v. Advanced Cluster Sys., Inc.*, IPR-2025-00913, Paper 13, 2 (finding “Patent Owner has not developed strong settled expectations” as patents issued in 2022, 2023, and 2025 “have not been in force for a significant period of time”); *MIM Software Inc. v. Progenics Pharms., Inc.*,

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

IPR2025-00630, Paper 13, 2. The Director has also found patents do not have settled expectations if the patents have not been commercialized, asserted, marketed, or licensed. *See e.g., Home Depot USA Inc., v. H2 Intellect LLC*, IPR2025-00480, Paper 11, 2–3. No assignee of the '590 patent has ever claimed to have made, commercialized, asserted, marketed, licensed, or otherwise used the alleged invention. (EX1078, 13–14.) The Director has likewise emphasized that “early challenges favor robust, predictable patent rights and weigh against discretionary denial.” *MIM Software Inc. v. Progenics Pharms., Inc.*, IPR2025-00630, Paper 13, 2. Amazon’s challenge is early—it filed its Petition less than four years after the patent issued and about four months from suit.

Patent Owner argues that it has settled expectations based on the patent’s 2012 priority date. (Br., 16.) Patent Owner cites *no* authority for this position, nor could it. First, there is no statutory basis to petition for *inter partes* review of a patent application. 35 U.S.C. § 311(a). Patent Owner simply cannot have settled expectations in an unissued application. Additionally, Patent Owner created its own delay by waiting over five years to file the '710 application (the earliest issued patent in the family). Patent Owner cannot claim settled expectations now.

Patent Owner’s assertion that Amazon should have filed its Petition immediately after the July 23, 2024, pre-suit letter is contradicted by the Board’s settled practice. (Br., 13.) Again, Patent Owner cites *no* authority. On the

contrary, the Board “recognizes that it is often reasonable for a petitioner to wait to file its petition until it learns which claims are being asserted . . . [and i]f the evidence shows that the petitioner filed the petition expeditiously, . . . , this fact weigh[s] against . . . deny[ing] institution.” *Apple v. Fintiv*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11, 11. Here, Patent Owner asserted more claims in litigation than in its pre-suit letter, and Petitioner acted expeditiously by filing the Petition barely two months after Patent Owner’s disclosure of asserted claims in its infringement contentions and only four months after the Patent Owner filed suit.

B. This IPR Will Allow the Office to Correct Material Errors During Prosecution

This Petition presents an opportunity to correct Examiner errors. During prosecution, the Board already found nearly all substantially identical claims anticipated or obvious. (EX1003, 193–194.) The Examiner then committed a series of material errors: (1) misreading the Board’s decision as “allow[ing]” the claims, (2) failing to update search strings despite newly added limitations, and (3) failing to consider an obviousness rejection based on existing record.

The Board affirmed nearly all of the Examiner’s rejections. An anticipation rejection of claim 32 was reversed, merely because the Examiner had improperly combined embodiments in the same reference. However, the applicant then

incorporated claim 32 into claim 1, erroneously asserting “the content of the PTAB *allowed* claim 32 is incorporated into claim 1.” (EX1003, 178–179.)

Yet the Examiner took the applicant’s flawed premise. Not only did the Examiner allow the claims, he explicitly cited the PTAB decision as the basis for allowance. (EX1003, 34–35.) This is a fundamental misreading of the Board’s decision, which never “allowed” dependent claim 32 but merely reversed a procedurally improper anticipation rejection.

Patent Owner’s contention that the Examiner “fully examined” the claims post-Board decision is belied by the record. (Br., 8–9.) The “thirteen prior art references” cited by Examiner post-Board decision were references recycled from past Office Actions—not from the new searches. (*Id.*; EX1003, 523–524; 36.) After the Board decision, the Examiner should have focused the search on the new limitation added after the Board decision: “a first sensor having an output that responds to a physical phenomenon” housed within the single enclosure. Yet the Examiner did not even search for the term “sensor.” Instead, the Examiner recycled completely *identical* patent classification search strings from before the amendment. (*See* EX1003, 69, 164–165 (searches L1-L10 are the same as searches S920-S929 performed before the amendment).) Notably, these classification searches mostly targeted *vehicle and transportation* classifications, which have nothing to do with the claims. (EX1003, 69.)

Even on the existing record without any additional searching, an obviousness rejection was warranted. The Board acknowledged that a reference disclosed both then-claim 1 and then-claim 32, only in separate embodiments—insufficient for anticipation. (EX1003, 197.) The Examiner himself acknowledged that the two embodiments were analogous, yet failed to raise a single-reference obviousness rejection that naturally followed. (EX1003, 348.)

C. There Are Compelling Economic and Public Interest Reasons to Examine the Challenged Claims

The '590 patent claims an AC-powered appliance with integrated sensors and a wireless transceiver that sends sensor data to a network and is controlled by network-received data—i.e., the core functionality of widely deployed IoT connected appliances. The breadth of the challenged claims affects a significant part of the U.S. economy, implicating millions of jobs and billions in economic activity. This IPR is an efficient use of Office resources to prevent abuse and review claims implicating a critical segment of our economy.

Patent Owner is a non-practicing entity formed less than one year ago for litigation. (EX1053; EX1054; EX1055; EX1003.) The '590 patent was initially assigned to May Patents Ltd. (“May Patents”), a foreign entity operated by the named inventors. *Id.* One of those inventors doubled as the patent agent prosecuting the patent. (EX1003; EX1054; EX1055.)

The applicant dragged its feet prosecuting the '590 application. In the roughly 10 years between the filing of the earliest provisional and issuance, American companies invested over \$4 billion in IoT research and development. (EX1056; EX1057; EX1058.) Amazon alone invested hundreds of millions. (EX1059; EX1060.) By the end of 2017, venture capital funds invested nearly \$5 billion in IoT startups. (EX1061.) The federal government even invested \$200 million in smart and connected devices. (EX1062; EX1063.) By July 2017, “[a]lmost any device you use in the home [] has a connected smart version from light bulbs and thermostats to tea kettles, fridges, and ovens.” (EX1064.) IoT technology extends to wearables, logistics, and fleet management. (*Id.*) The industry is estimated to generate \$2.8-\$6.3 trillion in economic value globally in 2025, and is expected to grow to \$5.5-\$12.6 trillion by 2030. (EX1065.) One billion smart devices are projected to be shipped in 2028. (EX1070.)

Because Patent Owner is asserting its patent against IoT appliances, the '590 patent's patentability affects a significant part of the U.S. consumer-electronics sector, implicating an estimated \$6.3 trillion global IoT industry. (EX1065.) Moreover, Patent Owner has asserted the '590 patent and the above related patents against Petitioner Amazon Services, LLC. Petitioner is an American company responsible for \$1.8 trillion in investments in the U.S. economy since 2010 and supports almost five million jobs across the country. (EX1066.) Patent Owner has

never produced a product, yet it seeks to stifle innovation and encumber the consumer-electronics industry in America. As the Petition demonstrates, the challenged claims are unpatentable: they cover well-known technology readily disclosed in prior patents and publications.

D. This IPR Will Promote Efficiency And Prevent Serial Litigation

Patent Owner continues to prosecute continuation applications—fourteen pending when suit was filed and six filed thereafter (EX1071)—and may file more. Patent Owner can thus pursue patentably indistinct claims and later assert them against Petitioner. These IPRs will efficiently resolve future disputes and prevent serial litigation. If the claims are held unpatentable, Patent Owner would be estopped from later obtaining patentably indistinct claims. 37 C.F.R.

§42.73(d)(3)(i); *SoftView LLC v. Apple Inc.*, 108 F.4th 1366 (Fed. Cir. 2024).

E. 35 U.S.C. § 325(d) Does Not Apply

It is undisputed that none of Petitioner’s art or arguments were previously presented or considered by the Office. (Br., 9-10.) The first part of the *Advanced Bionics* framework is thus not met. *Apple Inc. v. Seven Networks, LLC*, IPR2020-00285, Paper 10, 31 (PTAB Jul. 28, 2020).

Patent Owner nevertheless contends the Petition “relies on the same types of ideas,” but cannot pinpoint any concrete similarity other than they “fit within that same technical space.” (Br., 7–8.) That is true for all analogous art. *See PLR*

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

Worldwide Sales Ltd. v. Flip Phone Games, Inc., IPR2024-00171, Paper 9, 6 (PTAB May 10, 2024) (“It is no surprise that Petitioner would rely on art” that discloses the subject matter recited in the claims).

III. THE *FINTIV* FACTORS WEIGH STRONGLY AGAINST DENIAL

The scheduled trial date is *after* the anticipated Final Written Decision deadline, and the trial date will likely be delayed even further. The parallel litigation is in its early stages, *Markman* is not until end of the year, and there have been no substantive rulings. Importantly, the merits are strong; Patent Owner does not (and cannot) identify *any* substantive deficiencies in the Petition or declaration.

A. Factor 1: Likelihood of Post-Institution Stay is Neutral

The Board has previously refused to speculate whether Judge Gilstrap will enter a stay after institution. *See SAP Am., Inc. v. Cyandia, Inc.*, IPR2024-01433, Paper 13, 9 (PTAB April 7, 2025); *BOE Tech. Grp. Co., Ltd. v. Optronic Scis., LLC*, IPR2024-01133, Paper 16, 9 (PTAB January 27, 2025); *Hanwha Sols. Corp., v. Maxeon Solar Pte. Ltd.*, IPR2024-01203, Paper 17, 12–13 (PTAB February 26, 2025). Accordingly, this factor is at best neutral.

Patent Owner argues that a stay is “unlikely.” (Br., 10–11.) But stays are frequently granted if the court has not yet held a *Markman* hearing. *See, e.g., Broadphone LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 2:23- CV-00001, 2024 WL 3524022, at *2-3 (E.D. Tex. July 24, 2024); *Foras Technologies Ltd. v. Aptiv PLC*, No. 2:23-

CV-00314, 2024 WL 5348631, at *2 (E.D. Tex. July 25, 2024). The litigation is in its early stages, and the *Markman* is scheduled well after the Board’s institution deadline of May 28, 2026. Although Patent Owner claims that a stay motion would not be resolved before the *Markman*, it provides no support. (Br., 12.) Further, Judge Gilstrap resolves motions to stay pending *inter partes* review motions quickly, typically less than 40 days. (EX1067.) Thus, the court is likely to consider a motion to stay pre-*Markman* and decide it expeditiously.

Patent Owner further claims that a stay is unlikely because Petitioner has not yet filed petitions for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent Nos. 12,401,720 and 12,401,721. (Br., 11–12; IPR2026-00276; IPR2026-00280.) Patent Owner added those patents in October 2025, two months after they issued. Amazon diligently prepared petitions. As of the date of this opposition, Amazon has petitioned for review of the ’721 patent and will soon file a petition for review of the ’720 patent.

B. Factor 2: Weighs Against Denial - District Court Trial Will Occur *After* the FWD

Patent Owner asserts that “this factor strongly weighs in favor of discretionary denial.” (Br., 13–14.) That is incorrect. Patent Owner admits that trial is set for June 7, 2027, *after* the projected Final Written Decision due date in May 2027. (*Id.*, 13–14.) Thus, this factor weighs strongly against denial.

The trial date, moreover, is also likely to be delayed, even further after the

projected Final Written Decision date. As of September 2025, the median time-to-trial in the Eastern District of Texas is 24.5 months. (EX1068, 35.) Trial in the district court litigation would likely be delayed to August 2027, almost *three months after* the Final Written Decision deadline. Judge Gilstrap's increasing caseload also shows that trial will likely be delayed. Judge Gilstrap has been assigned over 1,015 patent cases in 2025, more than half of which remain open. (EX1069.) Trial conflicts often cause delays in his heavy caseload. *See, e.g., Headwater Rsch. LLC v. AT&T Inc.*, No. 2:23-cv-00397 (E.D. Tex. Sep. 1, 2023) (resetting trial from June 2, 2025 (ECF 41) to November 17, 2025); *CLO Virtual Fashion Inc. v. Zhejiang Lingdi Digital Technology Co., Ltd.*, No. 2:23-cv-00274 (E.D. Tex. June 14, 2023) (resetting trial, for the ninth time, from April 7, 2025 (ECF 32) to October 27, 2025).

Judge Gilstrap regularly double- or triple-tracks trial dates. The Board has held that *Fintiv* factor 2 is "neutral or weighs slightly in favor of not exercising [] discretion" where Judge Gilstrap "set 10 cases for jury selection on the same day," because of "uncertainty whether the trial in that proceeding would actually begin on that date." *BOE Tech. Grp. Co. v. Optronix Scis. LLC*, IPR2024-01130, Paper 16, 10 (PTAB Jan. 27, 2025). This trial date is shared by *six* others. (EX1072-77.)

Patent Owner's reliance on selective quotes from *Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. Concurrent Ventures, LLC* is misplaced. IPR2025-00223, Paper 9, 2–3

(P.T.A.B. June 12, 2025) (“*AMD*”). The denial in *AMD* turned on i) a trial date that is *before* the final written decision deadline, ii) speculation of the court granting a motion to transfer, and iii) substantial investment in litigation. *Id.*, 2–3. Here, trial is scheduled for *after* the Final Written Decision deadline. Unlike *AMD*, where *Markman* would occur *before* the institution decision and the parties had engaged in seven months of fact discovery (*id.*, 2–3), discovery has just begun and *Markman* is almost seven months *after* the institution deadline.

C. Factor 3: Weighs Against Denial - Investment in the District Court Is Not “Substantial”

The parties’ investment in the district court proceeding is far from “substantial.” (Br., 13.) Fact discovery just began, and the parties have yet to take any depositions. Claim construction briefing will not begin until November 2026. (EX2004, 4.) The district court has not issued any substantive rulings, and has not considered the unpatentability arguments at issue in this Petition. That will still be true when an institution decision comes in late May.

The only motion pending in the district court is a partial motion to dismiss, which does not overlap with the Petition’s prior art challenges. Other than that, the Court is not likely to issue any rulings before the institution decision on May 28, 2026. “If, at the time of the institution decision, the district court has not issued orders related to the patent at issue in the petition, this fact weighs against

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

exercising discretion.” *Apple Inc. v Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11, 9–10 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020); *see also Bio-Rad Lab ’ys, Inc. v. Cal. Inst. of Tech.*, IPR2024-01451, Paper 11, 10 (PTAB Mar. 27, 2025) (weighing against exercising discretion because “expert reports, expert discovery, expert depositions, and pretrial motions and disclosures” had yet to occur).

Finally, Patent Owner’s suggestion that it “prepar[ed] and fil[ed]” the complaint in reliance on Amazon’s “delay” in filing its petition after receiving Patent Owner’s pre-suit letter is simply not credible. *See supra* Section II.A.

D. Factor 4: Sotera Stipulation Weighs Against Denial

Consistent with Patent Office precedent, Amazon committed to a full *Sotera* stipulation. Amazon’s *Sotera* stipulation requires that if the Board institutes *inter partes* review, it will not advance in the parallel district court proceeding “any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that *inter partes* review.” (Paper 6, 1.) The *Sotera* stipulation “weighs strongly in favor of not exercising discretion to deny institution” because it “obviate[s] much, if not all, of any potential overlap between the issues in the proceeding and the district court proceeding.” *Liberty Energy Servs. LLC v. U.S. Well Servs., LLC*, IPR2025-00139, Paper 14, 13–14 (June 11, 2025); *see also Stingray Grp. Inc. v. Hernandez-Mondragon*, IPR2025-00349, Paper 19, 7–8 (June 13, 2025) (same); *Kubota N. Am. Corp. v. Vermeer Mfg. Co.*, IPR2025-00170, Paper 15, 13 (June 10, 2025)

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

(same); *Apple Inc. v. Vampire Labs, LLC*, IPR2025-01215, Paper 8, 8-9 (Oct. 17, 2025) (referencing Sotera stipulation), Paper 10, 2 (Dec. 1, 2025) (granting institution); *Google LLC v. Sandpiper CDN, LLC*, IPR2025-00969, Paper 8, 2 (Sep. 18, 2025) (referencing Sotera stipulation), Paper 13, 2 (Oct. 10, 2025) (referring for merits review), Paper 14, 17 (Nov. 28, 2025) (granting institution), Paper 19, 2 (Jan. 12, 2026) (denying director review).

Patent Owner's authority does not show otherwise. In *Motorola Sols., Inc.*, the Director found that petitioner's *Sotera* stipulation "may mitigate some concern of duplication between the [litigation] proceeding and [the IPR] proceeding," but denied review because the stipulation did not "outweigh the substantial investment in the district court proceeding or *Fintiv* factors 1, 2, and 5." *Motorola Sols., Inc. v. Stellar, LLC*, IPR2024-01205, Paper 19, 4 (PTAB Mar. 28, 2025). But that case was much farther along; "the parties had . . . served . . . expert reports, filed claim construction briefs, and conducted several depositions" and "[t]he court [] had . . . construed the disputed claim terms." *Id.*, 3. Here the district court proceeding has not reached any of those stages.

Further, Patent Owner's argument regarding the newly asserted '720 and '721 patents is moot because Amazon has acted quickly to file those petitions. (*See supra* Section III.A; Br., 4–5.) And the Petition also includes claims (2-6, 8-19, 25, 29-31, 33, 39-47, 51, 54, 56-59) not asserted in the district court litigation.

Petitioner’s *Sotera* stipulation and additional challenged claims in the Petition weigh against denial.

E. Factor 5: Identity of the Parties Weighs Against Denial Because the FWD Is Likely to Precede the Trial

The parties are the same in the parallel district court litigation and this IPR. Where, as here, the FWD “is likely to issue before the district court trial,” this factor weighs “against exercising discretion.” *BMW of N. Am., LLC v. Mich. Motor Techs. LLC*, IPR2023-01234, Paper 11, 14–15 (PTAB Jan. 26, 2024).

F. Factor 6: Other Considerations Weigh Strongly Against Discretionary Denial

The strength of the petition weighs against discretionary denial. There are compelling economic and public interests to examine the challenged claims (*see supra* Section II.C) and this IPR will allow the Office to correct material errors during prosecution (*see supra* Section II.B). And, the Petition is strong on merits.

1. The grounds are straightforward and compelling

Patent Owner’s sole complaint about the Petition has nothing to do with the merits. Patent Owner fixates on the number of asserted grounds and references. (Br., 7.) But the Board evaluates a petition’s substantive limitation-by-limitation showing, not merely the number of references cited or the number of grounds. *Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Resonant Sys., Inc.*, IPR2023-00993, Paper 17, 24 (PTAB Jan. 10, 2024) (“The Board’s concern in *Adaptics* was not the number of

grounds, references, or asserted claims, but that ‘the Petition suffers from a lack of particularity that results in voluminous and excessive grounds.’”). The Petition provides clear limitation-by-limitation analysis, and each of the grounds is straightforward. There are only *two* grounds against the sole independent claim: a *single-reference* ground and a *two-reference* combination, and each dependent ground adds only *one reference*. (Pet., 7.)

Patent Owner complains that the Petition has eleven references and fifteen grounds. (Br., 7.) But this is because it chose to include dependent claims reciting nothing more than details of how conventional components work. They span everything from various home appliances (*e.g.*, claims 2–6), generic power switching and electrical measurement components such as switches (*e.g.*, claims 7–19, 32), standard networking protocols (*e.g.*, claims 20–31), generic sensors (*e.g.*, claims 33–49), routine lighting components (*e.g.*, claims 50–52), generic actuators (*e.g.*, 53–59), to conventional addressing schemes (*e.g.*, claims 60–63). These features were so trivial (*e.g.*, that a “sounder” is for “converting an electrical energy to . . . sound waves” in claim 55) that they are not normally described in patent filings. Thus, the total number of references and grounds reflects the lack of focus—and lack of real innovation—by the Patent Owner and counsels against discretionary denial.

Petitioner’s secondary references underscore how unremarkable the claimed inventions are. The references include a layman *manual* (*Wireless Home Networking Simplified*) and *textbooks* on electronics (*Practical Electronics for Inventors*), speech processing (*Springer Handbook of Speech Processing*), networking (*Wireless Communications*), acoustics (*Springer Handbook of Acoustics*), current sensors (*Handbook of Sensors and Actuators: Measuring Current, Voltage and Power*) and general sensors (*Handbook of Modern Sensors*). These are basic materials, not frontier research, and they demonstrate non-inventiveness of the challenged claims.

Nor is the Petition “weak” because it “does not assert any anticipation.” (Br., 7.) The Office routinely institutes *inter partes* reviews for obviousness. *See, e.g., Apple Inc. v. Vampire Labs., LLC*, IPR2025-01215, Paper 2, 9 (Jun. 27, 2025) (presenting obviousness grounds); *id.*, Paper 10, 2 (granting institution). Finally, Patent Owner’s reliance on *Hisense USA Corp. v. Light Guide Innovations LLC*, IPR2025-01537 and *Hisense USA Corp. v. Light Guide Innovations LLC*, IPR2025-01526 is misplaced. (Br., 7.) These summary decisions offer no indication that the outcomes hinged on the number of references or grounds.

2. Patent Owner fails to show “gap” filling

Patent Owner identifies *no* substantive deficiencies in the expert declaration. Instead, it baldly asserts that the declaration “fill[s] in holes in the prior art,” but

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

provides no example (nor could it) of a single “gap.” (Br., 10); *see Cambridge Indus. USA, Inc., v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc.*, IPR2025-00434, Paper 11, 2 (PTAB, June 26, 2025) (denying request for discretionary denial and finding that “Patent Owner does not identify any portions of the expert testimony that suggest Petitioner is using its expert to fill gaps in the prior art.”).

Unable to find faults in the merits, Patent Owner resorts to attacking the length of the declaration. (Br., 7, 10-11.) But this is beside the point. Longer declarations are not grounds for discretionary denial. Patent Owner cites recent summary decisions denying institution on discretionary grounds to conclude that long declarations in those proceedings were the reasons for denial. (Br., 11.) This is unsupportable and ignores proceedings that were referred for merits considerations with similar or longer accompanying expert declarations for *far less* claims. *See, e.g., Ford Motor Co. v. Autoconnect Holdings LLC*, IPR2025-01383, Ex. 1003 (416 pages on 21 claims), IPR2025-01524, Ex. 1003 (258 pages on 21 claims), IPR2025-01342, Ex. 1003 (313 pages on 21 claims); IPR2025-01383, Ex. 1003 (416 pages on 21 claims); *3D Sys. Corp. v. Intrepid Automation, Inc.*, IPR2025-01241, Ex. 1003 (286 pages on 20 claims).

In fact, the Declaration’s length reflects Amazon’s compliance with USPTO requirements. (*See* July 31, 2025, Memorandum on Permissible Uses of General Knowledge in Inter Partes Reviews.) As an initial matter, it is readily apparent—

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

even from a cursory review—that most of the declaration consists of verbatim quotations from references and claims for readability. The remaining portions do not supply missing elements and Patent Owner did not point to any. They provide technical background and context, as well as scientific principles underlying the Petitioner’s arguments. (*E.g.*, EX1002, 161-165, 192-200, 217-219.) Petitioner’s compliance with the Office procedure is not grounds to deny.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that Patent Owner’s request be denied and the Petition be referred for merits consideration.

Dated: March 2, 2026

By: /s/ Alex S. Yap
Alex S. Yap
Reg. No. 60,609
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 6000
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Email: AYap@mofocom
Tel: (213) 892-5200

Counsel for Petitioner

IPR2026-00148
Patent No. 11,190,590

Certificate of Service (37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e)(4))

I hereby certify that the attached PETITIONER'S OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF INSTITUTION and supporting materials were served on the below date via email (by agreement) to the following counsel of record for Patent Owner:

Peter Lambrianakos
Vincent J. Rubino, III
Clark Gordon
Ryan F. Oliver
ptab@fabricantllp.com

Dated: March 2, 2026

/s/ Alex S. Yap

Alex S. Yap