

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

ORCKIT CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2023-00402
Patent No. 8,830,821

**PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY
IN SUPPORT OF PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Petitioner’s Reply does not address “the changed median time-to-trial statistics in the Eastern District of Texas as it relates to the second factor of the *Fintiv* analysis” as authorized by the Board. Indeed, Petitioner does not dispute that Factor 2 strongly favors noninstitution. Instead, the Reply argues, without support, that Factor 2 is “not generally given heavy weight in the overall *Fintiv* analysis” and that the other factors favor institution. Paper 8. Petitioner understates Factor 2’s weight. The Interim *Fintiv* Memo cautioned that “the proximity to trial should not alone outweigh” all other factors. *Id.*, 8. Thus, Factor 2, while not dispositive alone, is given substantial weight in the analysis.

Petitioner’s authority is distinguishable. Both decisions are COVID-era opinions that discuss trial dates from district court scheduling orders (which the interim *Fintiv* Memo found are “unreliable and often change” (at 8)), not time-to-trial statistics. In *WSOU*, the Board held Factor 2 only slightly favored noninstitution because “there is not a definitive trial date for the [challenged patent].” IPR2021-00930, Paper 8, 9 (Dec. 2021). Further, Petitioner argued there were “months of backlogged trials” in the district court. *Id.*, 8. In *PEAG*, the other factors strongly favored institution. IPR2020-01214, Paper 8, 19-20 (Jan. 2021) (“Significant in our determination is [no] substantial investment ..., Petitioner was diligent in filing [], the district court’s willingness to reconsider a stay [], and [] a strong showing on the merits...”). Accordingly, the Board should deny institution.

Date: July 24, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Stephen P. McBride
Stephen P. McBride
Reg. No. 78,396

James T. Carmichael
Reg. No. 45,306

Carmichael IP, PLLC

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the following document was served by electronic service, by agreement between the parties, on the date below:

**PATENT OWNER'S SUR-REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

The names and email addresses of the parties being served are as follows:

Theodore M. Foster	ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com
David L. McCombs	David.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com
Gregory P. Huh	Gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com
Calmann J. Clements	Calmann.clements.ipr@haynesboone.com

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen P. McBride

Date: July 24, 2023