

Morgan Lewis

Alexander B. Stein

Partner
+1.650.843.7278
alexander.stein@morganlewis.com

June 16, 2023

VIA EMAIL

Ashley N Moore
amoore@mrlp.com
Michelman & Robinson, LLP

Jennifer A Mauri
jmauri@mrlp.com
Michelman & Robinson, LLP

Kaleigh N Boyd
kboyd@tousley.com
Tousley Brain Stephens PLLC

Jessica E Pharis
jpharis@mrlp.com
Michelman & Robinson, LLP

Re: *RealD Spark, LLC v. Microsoft Corporation, Case No. 2:22-cv-00942-TL (W.D. WA)*

Dear Counsel:

I write regarding the above-captioned litigation (the “District Court Case”), and the related petition for *inter partes* review (IPR) in IPR2023-01046 that was filed today against certain claims of U.S. Patent No. 10,740,985.

Petitioner Microsoft Corporation (“Microsoft”) hereby stipulates that if the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) institutes an IPR based on the grounds identified below, then it will (i) not pursue the grounds identified below in the District Court Case, and (ii) not pursue any other ground that reasonably could have been raised during the IPR (should it be instituted) in the District Court Case.

The grounds presented in the IPR petition are reproduced below for convenience:

Ground	Prior Art	Statutory Basis	Claims Challenged from U.S. Patent No. 10,740,985
1	Ganin	§ 102	1-3, 5, 10, 12-14, and 18
2	Ganin + Liu	§ 103	16 and 19
3	Chalom + Aslan	§ 103	1-3, 5-6, 8-14, and 16-19
4	Chalom + Aslan + Grau	§ 103	4
5	Chalom + Aslan + Pace	§ 103	7

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

1301 Second Ave., Suite 2800
Seattle, WA
United States

 +1.206.274.6400
 +1.206.274.6401

June 16, 2023

Page 2

In so stipulating, Microsoft seeks to avoid multiple proceedings challenging the same claims on the same grounds. Consistent with Congressional intent, through this stipulation, Microsoft expresses its intentions to have only the PTAB address the patentability of the challenged claims identified above on the grounds identified above. However, if the PTAB declines institution as to any grounds, then Microsoft reserves the right to pursue any non-instituted grounds in the District Court Case.

This stipulation is not intended, and should not be construed, to limit Microsoft's abilities to assert invalidity or unenforceability of U.S. Patent No. 10,740,985 in the District Court Case on any other ground not covered by this stipulation (e.g., indefiniteness, written-description issues, enablement, unenforceability issues, invalidity on grounds that reasonably could not have been raised during the IPR if instituted).

Sincerely,

/ Alexander B. Stein /

Alexander B. Stein