

From: [Director_PTABDecision_Review](#)
To: [Elizabeth O'Brien](#); [Eagle Robinson](#)
Cc: tom@dunham.cc; [Chad Wallis](#); [Daniel Leventhal](#); [Tom Dunham](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00126: Document(s) Filed - oxylabs, UAB v. Bright Data Ltd.
Date: Friday, August 8, 2025 12:40:00 PM

Counsel,

The Acting Director entered a decision on Patent Owner's Request for Director Review without considering the arguments presented in Petitioner's Updated Mandatory Notice (Paper 29). Patent Owner's request for authorization to submit supplemental briefing is now moot.

Thank you.

From: Elizabeth O'Brien <elizabetho@cherianllp.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 5:06 PM
To: Eagle Robinson <eagle.robinson@nortonrosefulbright.com>; Director_PTABDecision_Review <Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov>
Cc: tom@dunham.cc; Chad Wallis <chad.wallis@nortonrosefulbright.com>; Daniel Leventhal <daniel.leventhal@nortonrosefulbright.com>; Tom Dunham <tomd@cherianllp.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00126: Document(s) Filed - oxylabs, UAB v. Bright Data Ltd.

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

Director,

In IPR2024-00126, Petitioner filed a paper characterized as "updated mandatory notices" (Paper 29) and Exhibits 1033-1034. Patent Owner immediately reached out to Petitioner regarding impermissible attorney argument in the paper and a lack of prior authorization for submitting new exhibits. Petitioner refused to withdraw/request expungement of the paper and exhibits.

Patent Owner respectfully requests supplemental briefing of 2-pages to address the attorney argument and the alleged impact of the Federal Circuit Opinion (Exhibit 1034) on this proceeding. Patent Owner additionally, respectfully requests authorization to submit the other Federal Circuit briefs (Appellees' Response and Appellant's Reply) as exhibits for consideration of the full record.

Petitioner informed Patent Owner that: Petitioner believes it was proper to submit Updated Mandatory Notices with a single paragraph factually describing and quoting two exhibits reflecting a directly-relevant aspect of a significant event (opinion) in the appellate proceeding identified pursuant to 37 CFR 42.8(b)(2). Nevertheless, Petitioner does not object to Patent

Owner submitting as exhibits additional briefing from that appellate proceeding, and would not oppose each party being granted two additional pages to more-fully address the Federal Circuit Opinion if the Director decides additional briefing would be helpful.

Thank you,
Elizabeth O'Brien
(Back-up Counsel for Patent Owner)

Elizabeth O'Brien
Cherian LLP
O: (202) 873-1726
M: (703) 930-0505

From: Eagle Robinson <eagle.robinson@nortonrosefulbright.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 3:13 PM
To: Director_PTABDecision_Review <Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov>
Cc: tom@dunham.cc; Chad Wallis <chad.wallis@nortonrosefulbright.com>; Elizabeth O'Brien <elizabetho@cherianllp.com>; Daniel Leventhal <daniel.leventhal@nortonrosefulbright.com>; Eagle Robinson <eagle.robinson@nortonrosefulbright.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00126: Document(s) Filed - oxylabs, UAB v. Bright Data Ltd.

Director Review Group,

Petitioner today filed the attached Updated Mandatory Notices and exhibits submitting the Federal Circuit's August 1 opinion in Appeal No. 23-2144, which resolved certain arguments raised in the briefing for the pending Director Review request in this proceeding.

Respectfully,

Eagle Robinson
Reg. No. 61,361
Lead Counsel for Petitioner

From: Director_PTABDecision_Review <Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2025 3:01 PM
To: Eagle Robinson <eagle.robinson@nortonrosefulbright.com>; tom@dunham.cc; Chad Wallis <chad.wallis@nortonrosefulbright.com>; elizabetho@cherianllp.com; Daniel Leventhal <daniel.leventhal@nortonrosefulbright.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00126: Document(s) Filed - oxylabs, UAB v. Bright Data Ltd.



External Email - Use Caution

Counsel,

Patent Owner's request for Director Review has been received in the above-referenced case. Petitioner is authorized to submit a response limited to the issues raised in the Director Review request, of no more than five pages, to be filed within five business days of this email. Any such response must be filed in P-TACTS, i.e., by selecting the "Other: Other" paper type and the paper must be titled "Authorized Response to Director Review Request" or it may not be considered. No new evidence is permitted. No further briefing is authorized at this time.

The Director will determine whether review will be granted or denied and the parties will be notified of the result of the Director Review request.

Thank you.

This email message and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message and any attachments.

To reply to our email administrator directly, send an email to nrfus.postmaster@nortonrosefulbright.com.

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, Norton Rose Fulbright LLP, Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP and Norton Rose Fulbright South Africa Inc are separate legal entities and all of them are members of Norton Rose Fulbright Verein, a Swiss verein. Norton Rose Fulbright Verein helps coordinate the activities of the members but does not itself provide legal services to clients. Details of each entity, with certain regulatory information, are available at nortonrosefulbright.com/legal-notices.