

From: [Dutta, Sanjeet K](#)
To: [Trials](#)
Cc: [Sanders, Carl](#); [Morlock, Michael](#); [Dabbiere, Courtney](#); [Adkins, Robin](#); [Kline, Douglas J](#); [Reddy, Srikanth K](#); [Birbach, Naomi](#); [Larochelle, Christie](#); [Woo, Darryl M](#); [Alemanni, John](#)
Subject: IPR2023-00199, 00220, 00221, and 00254
Date: Thursday, April 6, 2023 6:13:17 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

CAUTION: This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. **PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE** before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

Dear Board,

We write on behalf of Petitioners in IPR2023-00199, 00220, 00221, and 00254. Patent Owner filed its preliminary responses in each of these matters. Petitioner hereby requests a conference call with the panel and patent owner to request additional briefing (5 pages) to reply to factual misstatements in the Patent Owner's preliminary responses.

Patent Owner states that "while Petitioners alleged they were not aware of any secondary considerations ..., Petitioners have produced evidence under a protective order in the parallel ITC proceeding demonstrating Petitioners at least knew of evidence of industry praise directly tied to the claimed invention and had the evidence in their possession before filing...." See '595 POPR, p. 13 and '322 POPR, p. 12. MRI makes similar statements at the following pages:

- '595 POPR, pp. 1-2, 7 and 15
- '322 POPR, pp. 1-2, 7 and 15
- '142 POPR, pp. 1 and 18,19, and
- '740 POPR, pp. 1 and 17-18.

In each of these POPRs, MRI cites to two emails sent from Romulus Stoain of Samsung SDS America to Bill Dunn of MRI in April and May of 2020. Bates Nos. MRI-ITC-1331_0000435123-24, and MRI-ITC-1331_0000435125-127. Patent Owner produced these documents two months after the filing of the petitions -- Petitioners did not produce these documents. Further, Mr. Stoain was employed by Samsung SDS America and has never been an employee of the Petitioners. MRI has not cited any evidence that Petitioners were aware of these documents prior to their production by MRI on January 20, 2023.

On March 29, 2023 Petitioner communicated with Patent Owner requesting that they correct these misstatements. Patent Owner declined to do so, stating "there are no factual errors in the POPRs" on March 30, 2023. Petitioners request 5 pages of additional briefing to address these misstatements and clarify the record for the panel. Petitioners are available at any date/time that is convenient for the panel to conduct the conference call.

Regards,

Sanjeet K. Dutta
Partner



Goodwin Procter LLP
601 Marshall Street
Redwood City, CA 94063
o +1 650 752 3260
m +1 408 644 4064
f +1 650 471 6056
SDutta@goodwinlaw.com



[Diversity, Equity + Inclusion](#) | [Patent Trial + Appeal Board](#)

This message was sent from Goodwin Procter LLP and is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.
