

From: [Haber, Ben](#)
To: [Director PTABDecision Review](#)
Cc: [Cook, Brian](#); [Baxter, Jeff](#); rcowell@fabricantllp.com; vrubino@fabricantllp.com; jostling@fabricantllp.com; [Whit, Nicholas](#); eituralde@fabricantllp.com; [Fink, Tim](#); plambrianakos@fabricantllp.com
Subject: IPR2024-00002 - Request for Director Review
Date: Friday, May 3, 2024 7:50:57 PM

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

Dear Director Vidal,

Petitioner in the above-captioned IPR respectfully requests Director Review of the Board's decision not to institute review.

In the Decision, a divided Board panel concluded that Petitioner could not satisfy the reasonably likely standard because two prior art references (Louch and Duarte), which have almost identical disclosures to the patent, fail to teach or suggest several broad claim elements.

Petitioner hereby provides the following priority-ranked list of the issues for which Petitioner seeks Director Review:

1. Whether the majority erred as a matter of law when, in conflict with the recently issued guidelines regarding obviousness and other guidance in the MPEP, it found that prior art that teaches "substantially all" of a display does not teach the broadly claimed "whole" or "entire" display.
2. Whether the majority abused its discretion when, in conflict with recent Director Review decisions such as *Nearmap v. Eagle View Techs.*, it failed to permit Petitioner to address disputed claim construction issues and assumed an overly narrow meaning of non-technical terms used in non-technical ways.
3. Whether the majority abused its discretion when, in conflict with Board rules and recent Director Review decisions such as *Weber v. Provisur Techs.* and *Xerox v. Bytemark*, it identified additional obviousness

IPR2024-00002
Ex. 3100

arguments and evidence but failed to consider them.

For the reasons above, and further discussed in Petitioner's Request for Director Review, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Director review the majority's decision and correct the errors therein.

Thank You,
Ben Haber
Counsel for Petitioner, Samsung

From: PTACTS_System@uspto.gov <PTACTS_System@uspto.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 3, 2024 4:46 PM
To: Fink, Tim <tfink@omm.com>; plambrianakos@fabricantllp.com
Cc: Cook, Brian <bcook@omm.com>; Baxter, Jeff <jbaxter@omm.com>; rcowell@fabricantllp.com; vrubino@fabricantllp.com; Haber, Ben <bhaber@omm.com>; jostling@fabricantllp.com; Whilt, Nicholas <nwhilt@omm.com>; eiturralde@fabricantllp.com
Subject: IPR2024-00002: Document(s) Filed - Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. v. Slyde Analytics, LLC

[EXTERNAL MESSAGE]



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

Document Filing Notice

AIA Review No.: IPR2024-00002
Petitioner: Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. of Suwon-si, KR
Patent Owner: Slyde Analytics, LLC of , TX
Patent No.: 9651922
Submitted Date: 05/03/2024
Submitted By: Ben Haber, bhaber@omm.com

The following document(s) has/have been filed.

Document(s) List

No.	Document No.	Document Type	Document Name	Filing Party	Availability
		Request for Director			Available

1	14	Review - Institution Decision	Petitioner's Request for Director Review	Petitioner	for everyone.
---	----	----------------------------------	---	------------	------------------

Questions regarding this receipt should be directed to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at 571-272-7822 or e-mail to Trials@uspto.gov.

This e-mail is computer-generated. Do not reply to this e-mail because the e-mail box is not monitored.