Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 88
Date: February 4, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GREENTHREAD, LLC,
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2024-00470
Patent 11,121,222 B2

---

Before KRISTEN L. DROESCH, GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN, and STEPHEN E. BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

# ORDER
Granting Patent Owner's *Five* Motions to Seal
Granting Petitioner's *Four* Motions to Seal
Granting Patent Owner's Motion for Entry of Protective Order
Conduct of the Proceeding
*37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5, 42.14, 42.54*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner has filed *five* motions to seal in this case, namely (1) Paper 31 (September 25, 2024); (2) Paper 34 (November 8, 2024); (3) Paper 46 (March 28, 2025); (4) Paper 73 (August 12, 2025); and (5) Paper 81 (September 8, 2025) (collectively, "Patent Owner's Motions to Seal"). Collectively, Patent Owner's Motions to Seal seek to seal unredacted versions of Papers 7, 9, 35, 47, and 74 and Exhibits 2011, 2012, 2034, 2072, and 2088.

Petitioner has filed *four* motions to seal in this case, namely (1) Paper 27 (September 25, 2024); (2) Paper 29 (September 25, 2024); (3) Paper 41 (February 14, 2025); and (4) Paper 83 (September 9, 2025) (collectively, "Petitioner's Motions to Seal"). Collectively, Petitioner's Motions to Seal seek to seal unredacted versions of Papers 11, 15, 42, and 84.

On September 25, 2024, Patent Owner filed a Motion for Entry of Modified Protective Order ("Protective Order Motion"), which includes Patent Owner's proposed modified Protective Order as Appendix A ("Protective Order") and a redline comparison between Patent Owner's proposed modified Protective Order and the Board's default protective order as Appendix B. Paper 31. Patent Owner represents that Petitioner does not oppose the Protective Order Motion. *Id*. at 1.

Pursuant to our authority under 37 C.F.R. § 42.5 and to bring order to the record in this case, (1) we *grant* Patent Owner's Motions to Seal (Papers 31, 34, 46, 73, and 81); (2) we *grant* Petitioner's Motions to Seal

(Papers 27, 29, 41, and 83); (3) we *seal* Papers 7, 9, 11, 15, 35, 42, 47, 74, and 84 and Exhibits 2011, 2012, 2034, 2072, and 2088 (collectively, the "Sealed Documents");[1,2] and (4) we *grant* Patent Owner's Protective Order Motion (Paper 31) and *enter* the Protective Order.

Importantly, we urge Patent Owner and Petitioner to review the entire record to determine whether all papers and exhibits to be sealed are included in this Order and have corresponding redacted versions of such documents in the record. To the extent any additional action is needed in this regard, Patent Owner or Petitioner should inform the Board by email within ten (10) business days of this Order.

## II. MOTIONS TO SEAL

The record of an *inter partes* review shall be made available to the public, except as otherwise ordered, and a document filed with a motion to seal shall be treated as sealed until the motion is decided. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(1); 37 C.F.R. § 42.14. Only "confidential information" may be protected against public disclosure. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(7); 37 C.F.R.

---

[1] A redacted version of Paper 84 (Petitioner's Objections to Patent Owner's Demonstratives) does not appear in the record. Petitioner shall file a redacted version of Paper 84 within five (5) business days of this Order.

[2] Both the "sealed" and "redacted" versions of Exhibit 2088 presently of record are the *same* redacted demonstratives (i.e., no unredacted version was actually filed). Thus, we expunge the "sealed" version of Exhibit 2088, and Patent Owner shall file a corrected "sealed" version of Exhibit 2088 without redactions within five (5) business days of this Order.

§ 42.54. The Board observes a strong public policy in favor of making information filed in *inter partes* review proceedings open to the public. *See Argentum Pharms. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd.*, IPR2017-01053, Paper 27 at 3–4 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2018) (informative).

The standard for granting a motion to seal is "good cause." 37 C.F.R. § 42.54(a). The moving party bears the burden of showing that the relief requested should be granted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). That includes a sufficient showing that

> (1) the information sought to be sealed is truly confidential, (2) a concrete harm would result upon public disclosure, (3) there exists a genuine need to rely in the trial on the specific information sought to be sealed, and (4), on balance, an interest in maintaining confidentiality outweighs the strong public interest in having an open record.

*Argentum*, Paper 27 at 3–4; *see also Corning Optical Commc'ns RF, LLC v. PPC Broadband, Inc.*, IPR2014-00440, Paper 46 at 2 (PTAB April 6, 2015) (requiring a showing that information has not been "excessively redacted").

Upon review of Patent Owner's Motions to Seal (Papers 31, 34, 46, 73, and 81) and Petitioner's Motions to Seal (Papers 27, 29, 41, and 83) and the relevant documents, we are persuaded that good cause exists to seal the Sealed Documents based on the record before us.

## III. MODIFIED PROTECTIVE ORDER

The Board may, for good cause, issue a protective order "to protect a party or person from disclosing confidential information." 37 C.F.R. § 42.54(a). A protective order is not entered by default but must be proposed by one or more parties and must be approved and entered by the

Board. *See* Consolidated Trial Practice Guide ("Trial Practice Guide" or "CTPG")[3] at I.E.4; *see also* 84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019). The Trial Practice Guide sets forth specific guidelines on proposing a protective order and provides a Default Protective Order. *See* CTPG at I.E.4, App. B. The parties may propose modifications to the Default Protective Order and the Board will generally accept such proposed changes if they are consistent with the integrity and efficient administration of the proceedings. *Id.* at App. B(j). For example, the parties may agree to provide additional tiers or categories of confidential information, such as "Attorneys' Eyes Only," and the Board will presumptively accept agreed-to changes that provide additional categories of confidentiality as long as they are reasonable and adequately define what types of materials are to be included in the additional categories. *Id.*

Patent Owner seeks to modify the Board's Default Protective Order to add an additional category of "Outside Attorneys' Eyes Only" material that is more sensitive than materials in the "Confidential" category and "whose disclosure to in-house counsel or personnel of an opposing party would create a substantial risk of serious harm." Paper 31, App. A at 1. Patent Owner designates, for example, Exhibit 2072 as "PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL/ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" since it "contains highly competitively sensitive information related to licensing, including precise license terms and rates." Paper 34, 2.

[3] Available at www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/trial-practice-guide

We observe that the modified Protective Order differs from the Default Protective Order in that it provides an additional category of confidential information. Paper 31, App. B. After reviewing the proposed modifications to the Default Protective Order, we determine that the changes are consistent with the integrity and efficient administration of the proceedings. Accordingly, we grant Patent Owner's unopposed Protective Order Motion (Paper 31), and enter the Protective Order (Paper 31, App. A), which shall supersede any prior proposed protective orders proffered in Patent Owner's Motions to Seal.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Papers 7, 9, 11, 15, 35, 42, 47, 74, and 84 and Exhibits 2011, 2012, 2034, 2072, and 2088 shall be *sealed*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions to Seal (Papers 31, 34, 46, 73, and 81) are *granted* as to the Sealed Documents;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions to Seal (Papers 27, 29, 41, and 83) are *granted* as to the Sealed Documents;

FURTHER ORDERED that the "sealed" version of Exhibit 2088 shall be *expunged*; Patent Owner shall file a corrected "sealed" version of Exhibit 2088 without redactions within five (5) business days of this Order;[4]

[4] We note for the parties that page 148 of *redacted* Exhibit 2088 (i.e., the public version) includes a screenshot of page 1 of the Declaration of Mohan Rao (Ex. 2072), *without redactions*, while the redacted version of page 1 of that Declaration includes redacted material. We authorize Patent Owner to file a corrected redacted version of Exhibit 2088 to address this issue within five (5) business days of this Order.

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner shall file a *redacted* version of Paper 84 (Petitioner's Objections to Patent Owner's Demonstratives) within five (5) business days of this Order; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner's Protective Order Motion (Paper 31) is *granted* and the Protective Order (Paper 31, App. A) shall be *entered* into the record.

For PETITIONER:

Miguel Bombach
John P. Schnurer
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
miguel.bombach@foley.com
john.schnurer@foley.com

John D. Esterhay
PERKINS COIE LLP
esterhay-ptab@perkinscoie.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Alan Whitehurst
Arvind Jairam
Scott W. Hejny
Archis “Neil” Ozarkar
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
awhitehurst@mckoolsmith.com
ajairam@mckoolsmith.com
shejny@mckoolsmith.com
nozarkar@mckoolsmith.com