

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CURRENT LIGHTING SOLUTIONS, LLC D/B/A GE CURRENT
Petitioner,

v.

JIAXING SUPER LIGHTING ELECTRIC APPLIANCE CO., LTD.
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00269 (Patent 10,560,989 B2)
IPR2023-00270 (Patent 9,723,662 B2)
IPR2023-00271 (Patent 10,295,125 B2)
IPR2023-00272 (Patent 10,830,397 B2)¹

Before BRIAN J. McNAMARA, NEIL T. POWELL, and
JULIET MITCHELL DIRBA, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

POWELL, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Joint Motion for Entry of Stipulated Protective Order
37 C.F.R. § 42.54

¹ This Order applies to each of the listed proceedings. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be docketed in each proceeding. Except as expressly authorized by the Board, however, the parties shall not use this caption for any subsequent papers.

IPR2023-00269 (Patent 10,560,989 B2)
IPR2023-00270 (Patent 9,723,662 B2)
IPR2023-00271 (Patent 10,295,125 B2)
IPR2023-00272 (Patent 10,830,397 B2)

INTRODUCTION

With our authorization, the parties filed a Joint Motion for Entry of Stipulated Protective Order in each of the above-identified proceedings. Paper 6 (“Motion” or “Mot.”).² With the Motion, the parties also filed as exhibits a copy of their stipulated Protective Order (Ex. 2001) and a redline comparison of their stipulated Protective Order to the Board’s default protective order (Ex. 2002).

The Motion explains that, compared to the Board’s default protective order, the parties’ stipulated Protective Order

(1) adds an “OUTSIDE COUNSEL ONLY” designation for confidential information “that has not been made publicly available and that is competitively sensitive—i.e., if disclosed, could reasonably be used to inform or guide business decisions that would compete with or otherwise harm the designating party,” and (2) clarifies procedures for disclosure to Party Experts.

Mot. 2. The parties contend that their changes to the default protective order conform with the Board’s guidance. Mot. 2–3 (citing Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide 107, 115–116 (Nov. 2019), *available at* <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>). We are persuaded that good cause exists for the parties’ changes to the default protective order.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the Joint Motion for Entry of Stipulated Protective Order is *granted*;

² For purposes of this Order, we cite only to the Motion and related exhibits filed in IPR2023-00269. In each of IPR2023-00270, IPR2023-00271, and IPR2023-00272, the parties’ Motion for Entry of Stipulated Protective Order and related exhibits appear substantively the same as the Motion and related exhibits in IPR2023-00269.

IPR2023-00269 (Patent 10,560,989 B2)
IPR2023-00270 (Patent 9,723,662 B2)
IPR2023-00271 (Patent 10,295,125 B2)
IPR2023-00272 (Patent 10,830,397 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' stipulated Protective Order shall apply in each of the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall promptly file their stipulated Protective Order as a paper in each of the above-identified proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties are authorized to list all of the above-identified proceedings on the caption page of their stipulated Protective Order.

IPR2023-00269 (Patent 10,560,989 B2)
IPR2023-00270 (Patent 9,723,662 B2)
IPR2023-00271 (Patent 10,295,125 B2)
IPR2023-00272 (Patent 10,830,397 B2)

PETITIONER:

Eagle H. Robinson
Valerie K. Barker
Catherine J. Garza
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP
eagle.robinson@nortonrosefulbright.com
valerie.barker@nortonrosefulbright.com
cat.garza@nortonrosefulbright.com

PATENT OWNER:

Patrick J. McKeever
Miguel Bombach
Evan Day
Han-Wei Chen
PERKINS COIE LLP
mckeever-ptab@perkinscoie.com
bombach-ptab@perkinscoie.com
day-ptab@perkinscoie.com
chen-ptab@perkinscoie.com