

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. AND  
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

MANUFACTURING RESOURCES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2023-00220 (Patent 9,173,322 B2)  
IPR2023-00221 (Patent 11,013,142 B2)  
IPR2023-00254 (Patent 10,506,740 B2)  
IPR2023-00255 (Patent 6,920,527 B2)

---

Before, JAMESON LEE, JO-ANNE M. KOKOSKI, and MINN CHUNG,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

LEE, *Administrative Patent Judge.*<sup>1</sup>

ORDER  
Conduct of Proceeding  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.5*

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties are not authorized to use a combined caption for multiple proceedings but must file papers separately in each proceeding. Our use of a combined caption does not mean these proceedings have been consolidated.

IPR2023-00220 (Patent 9,173,322 B2)  
IPR2023-00221 (Patent 11,013,142 B2)  
IPR2023-00254 (Patent 10,506,740 B2)  
IPR2023-00255 (Patent 6,920,527 B2)

### Introduction

On April 20, 2023, Patent Owner sent an email to the Board (Ex. 3004) in which it is stated: “We request that the Petitions be denied immediately” in IPR2023-00220, IPR2023-00221, IPR2023-00254, and IPR2023-00255. The email includes five paragraphs of purported justification for the request and includes, as an attachment, an email chain between the parties. The gist of the assertions is that the Petitions in these proceedings exceed the maximum word count for petitions (14,000 words) by thousands of words. Specifically, Patent Owner contends that the word count for the Petition in IPR2023-00221 is greater than 17,000 words and the word count for the Petition in IPR2023-00254 is greater than 16,000 words.

### Discussion

Patent Owner’s email is not a request for authorization to file a motion but instead is the motion itself including five paragraphs of justification for the motion and an attachment of an email chain as evidence. As such, the email violates 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(b), which provides that “[a] motion will not be entered without prior authorization.” Prior authorization was neither requested nor given by the Board.

### Order

It is

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s request via email (Ex. 3004) is *denied*; and

IPR2023-00220 (Patent 9,173,322 B2)  
IPR2023-00221 (Patent 11,013,142 B2)  
IPR2023-00254 (Patent 10,506,740 B2)  
IPR2023-00255 (Patent 6,920,527 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner shall submit a recertification, within three business days of the date of this communication, that its Petitions satisfy the word count limit of 14,000 words while counting every word within tables and charts in the body of the Petitions; and

FURTHER ORDERED that if Petitioner cannot recertify that its Petitions satisfy the 14,000 maximum word count while counting every word within the tables and charts in the body of the Petitions, then Petitioner shall propose, for each Petition that exceed the maximum word count, one or more remedies for the violation of the maximum word count for the Board to consider.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The proposed remedy or remedies shall focus on reducing the words in the Petitions without need for Patent Owner to file a supplemental Preliminary Response, such as by use of strike-outs or text removal in the filing of a Corrected Petition, rather than to accord Patent Owner additional words in future filings by Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00220 (Patent 9,173,322 B2)  
IPR2023-00221 (Patent 11,013,142 B2)  
IPR2023-00254 (Patent 10,506,740 B2)  
IPR2023-00255 (Patent 6,920,527 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Sanjeet Dutta  
Douglas J. Kline  
Naomi Birbach  
GOODWIN PROCTOR LLP  
sdutta@goodwinlaw.com  
dkline@goodwinlaw.com  
nbirbach@goodwinlaw.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

John C. Alemanni  
Carl Sanders  
Michael T. Morlock  
Courtney Dabbieri  
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP  
jalemanni@kilpatricktownsend.com  
csanders@kilpatricktownsend.com  
mmorlock@kilpatricktownsend.com  
cdabbieri@kilpatricktownsend.com