IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CIRRUS LOGIC, INC.;
OMNIVISION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; AND
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED,
Petitioner,
v.

GREENTHREAD LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2024-00001[1]
Patent No. 10,734,481

PETITIONER'S MOTION TO SEAL PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14 & 42.54

[1] Texas Instruments Inc. ("TI"), which filed a petition in IPR2024-00772, has been joined as a party to this proceeding.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14 and 42.54, Cirrus Logic, Inc., OmniVision Technologies, Inc., and Texas Instruments Inc. ("Petitioner") respectfully submits this Motion to Seal. Petitioner moves to seal Petitioner's Authorized Response to Director Review Request (filed concurrently with the present Motion) in its entirety. Petitioner will file a redacted version of the document in due course. Petitioner conferred with Patent Owner, who indicated that it would not oppose.

I. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS

The Office Trial Practice Guide (TPG) states that "a document or thing will be made publicly available, unless a party files a motion to seal that is then granted by the Board." Office Trial Practice Guide (Nov. 2019) at 19; *see also* 35 U.S.C. §316(a)(7). "The document or thing will be protected on receipt of the motion and remain so, pending the outcome of the decision on motion." *Id.* The TPG states that "protective orders may be issued for good cause by the Board to protect a party from disclosing confidential information." *Id.* at 20 (citing C.F.R. § 42.54). Here, there is good cause for sealing Petitioner's Authorized Response to Director Review Request because it contains information that Patent Owner appears to claim is under confidentiality obligations regarding licensing information.

II. PROTECTIVE ORDER

Patent Owner previously requested entry of a modified protective order. Upon entry of that modified protective order, Petitioner designates Petitioner's Authorized

Response to Director Review Request in its entirety as "PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL."

As discussed above, Petitioner will file a redacted copy of the document in due course.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner requests that the Board seal Petitioner's Authorized Response to Director Review Request in its entirety, subject to the later filing of the redacted public version of this document.

Date: December 4, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: / Scott C. Weidenfeller /

Scott C. Weidenfeller
Registration No.: 54,531
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
One CityCenter,
850 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4956
Telephone: (202) 662-5923
Facsimile: (202) 778-5923

Counsel for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.6(e), I hereby certify that the foregoing Petitioner's Motion to Seal was served by email on the following counsel for Patent Owner:

Alan L. Whitehurst, awhitehurst@mckoolsmith.com
Nicholas T. Matich, nmatich@mckoolsmith.com
Arvind Jairam, ajairam@mckoolsmith.com
Scott W. Hejny, shejny@mckoolsmith.com
Stuart McCommas, smccommas@mckoolsmith.com
Archis "Neil" Ozarkar, nozarkar@mckoolsmith.com
Greenthread-Cirrus-MS@mckoolsmith.com
Greenthread-Omnivision-MS@mckoolsmith.com

Date: December 4, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: / Scott C. Weidenfeller /

Scott C. Weidenfeller
Registration No.: 54,531
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
One CityCenter,
850 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4956
Telephone: (202) 662-5923
Facsimile: (202) 778-5923

Counsel for Petitioner