

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**

CORRIGENT CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 6:22-cv-396-ADA-DTG

**DEFENDANT CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.’S STIPULATION REGARDING INVALIDITY
CONTENTIONS FOR U.S. PATENT NO. 7,593,400**

On December 23, 2022, Defendant Cisco Systems, Inc. filed petition no. IPR2023-00370 with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB”), requesting *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,593,400 (“the ’400 patent”).

The petition asserts five grounds of invalidity: (1) claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 13, and 16 of the ’400 patent would have been obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0198371 (“Smith”); (2) claims 1–3 and 11–13 would have been obvious over Smith in view of Japanese Patent Application No. 2005/086668 (“Ishimori”); (3) claims 1, 4–7, 10–11, 14–17, and 20 would have been obvious over Smith, in view of Ishimori, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,198 (“Edsall”); (4) claims 8–9 and 18–19 would have been obvious over Smith in view of Ishimori in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0133619 (“Zelig”); and (5) claims 9 and 19 would have been obvious over Smith in view of Ishimori in further view of Zelig and IEEE Standard 802.1Q, Virtual Bridged Local Area Networks, 1998 Edition (“802.1Q”).

Defendant stipulates that if the PTAB institutes IPR on the grounds presented in the petition, Petitioners will not pursue in the co-pending district court litigation the specific grounds

asserted in the petition, or any other ground that was raised or could have been reasonably raised in an IPR (*i.e.*, grounds that could have been raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of prior art patent or printed publications). *See Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.*, No. IPR2020-00109, Paper 12 at 18–19 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 1, 2020).

In so stipulating, Cisco seeks to avoid a situation in which multiple proceedings address the validity of the challenged claims based on the same grounds. Instead, through this Stipulation, Cisco expresses its preference that only the PTAB address the grounds of invalidity raised or that could have been reasonably raised in the IPR for these claims.

Notwithstanding this Stipulation, Cisco reserves the right to assert in this litigation any grounds or claims on which the Board declines to institute *inter partes* review. Cisco also reserves the right to assert grounds other than the grounds raised or could have been reasonably raised in the IPR for these claims.

Dated: June 20, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian A. Rosenthal, with permission by
Shaun W. Hassett

Michael E. Jones
State Bar No. 10929400
mikejones@potterminton.com
Shaun W. Hassett
State Bar No. 24074372
shaunhassett@potterminton.com
POTTER MINTON, P.C.
102 N. College Ave., Suite 900
Tyler, Texas 75702
Tel: (903) 597-8311
Fax: (903) 593-0846

Brian A. Rosenthal
broenthal@gibsondunn.com
Katherine Dominguez (*pro hac vice*)
kdominguez@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166-0193
Telephone: 212.351.4000
Facsimile: 212.351.4035

Stuart M. Rosenberg (*pro hac vice*)
srosenberg@gibsondunn.com
Ryan K. Iwahashi (*pro hac vice*)
riwahashi@gibsondunn.com
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1881 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1211
Telephone: 650.849.5300
Facsimile: 650.849.5333

Attorneys for Defendant Cisco Systems, Inc.