Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper No. 80
Entry Date: May 28, 2025

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CIRRUS LOGIC, INC., OMNIVISION TECHNOLOGIES, INC., and TEXAS INSTRUMENTS, INC.
Petitioner,

v.

GREENTHREAD, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00001 (Patent 10,734,481 B2) [1]
IPR2024-00016 (Patent 10,510,842 B2)
IPR2024-00017 (Patent 8,421,195 B2) [1]
IPR2024-00018 (Patent 9,190,502 B2) [1]
IPR2024-00019 (Patent 11,316,014 B2) [1]
IPR2024-00020 (Patent 11,121,222 B2)
IPR2024-00021 (Patent 11,121,222 B2) [2]

Before KRISTEN L. DROESCH, GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN, DONNA M. PRAISS, and MONICA S. ULLAGADDI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.[3]

ULLAGADDI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

---

[1] IPR2024-00771, IPR2024-00772, IPR2024-00773, and IPR2024-00774 were joined to IPR2024-00017, IPR2024-00001, IPR2024-00018, and IPR2024-00019, respectively, and thus, Texas Instruments was joined as a Petitioner to each of these proceedings.
[2] The parties are not authorized to use this style caption.
[3] This is not an expanded panel.

ORDER
Conduct of Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

I. BACKGROUND

In each of the above-captioned proceedings, Patent Owner has filed several motions to seal. The motions seek to seal papers and exhibits "in their entirety," but propose only some redacted documents. Therefore, it is unclear if the remaining documents are actually being requested to be sealed in their entirety, or if some redacted documents were mistakenly left unfiled. Instead of denying-in-part some of these motions without prejudice, we instruct Patent Owner to review the filings in each proceeding and submit redacted versions of any document Patent Owner asked to seal in its entirety if it has not already. If there is any particular document that Patent Owner seeks to seal in its entirety, please specifically indicate that in the chart below and provide reason(s) why.

Based on our review of the record, only two non-party names, some product names, and dollar amounts need to be redacted. If it is Patent Owner's view that other information is also confidential, Patent Owner shall indicate so in the table set forth below. It is not necessary to file a separate motion to seal for each individual paper. In the future, where it may be helpful to conserve resources, the parties shall group several papers and/or exhibits to be sealed in a single motion to seal. In cases where a Final Written Decision orders the parties to jointly propose a redacted Final Written Decision, it is not necessary to also submit a Joint Motion to Seal the Final Written Decision.

IPR2024-00001 (Patent 10,734,481 B2)
IPR2024-00016 (Patent 10,510,842 B2)
IPR2024-00017 (Patent 8,421,195 B2)
IPR2024-00018 (Patent 9,190,502 B2)
IPR2024-00019 (Patent 11,316,014 B2)
IPR2024-00020 (Patent 11,121,222 B2)
IPR2024-00021 (Patent 11,121,222 B2)

Given the Board's limited resources, we request that Patent Owner and Petitioner jointly file a chart for each individual proceeding that identifies: as yet undecided motions to seal and corresponding oppositions, replies, and sur-replies; documents sought to be sealed by each motion; corresponding redacted versions; and information sought to be sealed. For example, in IPR2024-00001,

Undecided Motion to Seal & any Opposition, Reply, & Sur-reply	**Document Sought to Be Sealed**	**Redacted Version**	**Information Sought to be Sealed**
Paper 51	Exhibit 2011 (Email requesting agreements and communications among certain parties)	[REDACTED] Ex. 2011	Names of potential privies/customers/members of joint defense group
	Exhibit 2016 (Email rejecting PO's request for agreements, communications, and indicating all RPIs identified)	[REDACTED] Ex. 2016	Names of potential Privies
	Exhibit 2022 (Partial License agreement between PO and RPX)	[REDACTED] Ex. 2022	Identity of Licensors in Litigations and Petitioners in IPRs
	Paper 9 (Motion for Additional Discovery)	Paper 40	Names of potential privies, some product names
	Paper 13 (Reply ISO Motion for Additional Discovery)	Paper 41	Names of potential privies, some product names

II. ORDER

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner is authorized to file redacted versions of documents it wishes to seal that are already the subject of a motion to seal in any of the above-captioned proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner and Petitioner shall jointly file a chart that complies with this Order within 2 weeks of the entry of this Order.

IPR2024-00001 (Patent 10,734,481 B2)
IPR2024-00016 (Patent 10,510,842 B2)
IPR2024-00017 (Patent 8,421,195 B2)
IPR2024-00018 (Patent 9,190,502 B2)
IPR2024-00019 (Patent 11,316,014 B2)
IPR2024-00020 (Patent 11,121,222 B2)
IPR2024-00021 (Patent 11,121,222 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Scott Weidenfeller
Anupam Sharma
Raj Paul
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
sweidenfeller@cov.com
asharma@cov.com
rpaul@cov.com

Gilbert Greene
William Liddell
DUANE MORRIS LLP
bgreene@duanemorris.com
waliddell@duanemorris.com

Daniel Nguyen
Emma Bennett
LOCKE LORD LLP
dnguyen@lockelord.com
emma.bennett@lockelord.com

David Bluestone
BENESCH FRIEDLANDER COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP
dbluestone@beneschlaw.com

IPR2024-00001 (Patent 10,734,481 B2)
IPR2024-00016 (Patent 10,510,842 B2)
IPR2024-00017 (Patent 8,421,195 B2)
IPR2024-00018 (Patent 9,190,502 B2)
IPR2024-00019 (Patent 11,316,014 B2)
IPR2024-00020 (Patent 11,121,222 B2)
IPR2024-00021 (Patent 11,121,222 B2)

For PATENT OWNER:

Alan Whitehurst
Nicholas Matich
Arvind Jairam
Stuart McCommas
Archis Ozarkar
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
awhitehurst@mckoolsmith.com
nmatich@mckoolsmith.com
ajairam@mckoolsmith.com
smccommas@mckoolsmith.com
nozarkar@mckoolsmith.com