

From: [Trials](#)
To: [Mudd, Jason \(SHB\)](#); [Schafer, Mark D. \(SHB\)](#); [Friesen, Kyle E. \(SHB\)](#); [Argenti, Matthew](#); [Rosato, Michael](#); [Mills, Jad](#)
Cc: [Trials](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2023-01186, -01187, -01188 (CSC ServiceWorks, Inc. v. PayRange, Inc.)
Date: Friday, November 24, 2023 8:57:20 AM

Counsel,

Petitioner's request is granted. In each proceeding, Petitioner is authorized to file a 7-page reply to the Patent Owner Preliminary Response in each IPR, to address Patent Owner's argument that the Petition does not identify all real-parties-in-interest. Additionally, the parties should indicate whether or not the proceeding is barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315. See *SharkNinja Operating LLC v. iRobot Corp.*, IPR2020-00734, Paper 11 (PTAB Oct. 6, 2020) (precedential). The reply is due no later than December 1, 2023. Patent Owner is authorized to file a 7-page sur-reply in each IPR no later than December 8, 2023.

Regards,

Andrew Kellogg,
Supervisory Paralegal
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
USPTO
andrew.kellogg@uspto.gov
(571)272-7822

From: Mudd, Jason (SHB) <jmudd@shb.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 22, 2023 10:17 AM
To: Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: Schafer, Mark D. (SHB) <MSCHAFER@shb.com>; Friesen, Kyle E. (SHB) <KFRIESEN@shb.com>; Argenti, Matthew <margenti@wsgr.com>; Rosato, Michael <mrosato@wsgr.com>; Mills, Jad <jmills@wsgr.com>
Subject: IPR2023-01186, -01187, -01188 (CSC ServiceWorks, Inc. v. PayRange, Inc.)

CAUTION: This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. **PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE** before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

Dear Board:

We write on behalf of Petitioner, CSC ServiceWorks, Inc., in connection with the above-referenced IPRs to respectfully request leave to file a reply brief to the Patent Owner Preliminary Responses in each of the above IPRs, limited to the topic of addressing Patent Owner's argument that the petitions did not identify all real-parties-in-interest. Petitioner respectfully requests 7 pages for each reply brief. Petitioner also requests that Patent Owner be allowed to file a sur-reply in each of the IPRs also limited to 7 pages. Petitioner submits that good cause for the replies exists because it was not foreseeable that Patent Owner would make some of the representations it did about Petitioner's relationship with KioSoft/TechTrex with respect to the RPI issue and because Petitioner needs to provide Petitioner's side to create a fulsome record.

Petitioner has conferred with Patent Owner regarding this request, and Patent Owner opposes this request. However, should the Board grant Petitioner's request, Patent Owner agrees that it should be given an equal number of pages to respond in a sur-reply.

Should the panel wish to conduct a conference call with the parties to discuss this request, the parties can provide their availabilities at the panel's request.

Sincerely,

Jason R. Mudd

Senior Counsel

Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P.

816-559-2437 | jmudd@shb.com



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message including attachments, if any, is intended for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.