Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 40
Date: October 17, 2025

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RAVIN CROSSBOWS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

MCP IP, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2024-00522[1]
Patent 8,683,989 B2

Case IPR2024-00523
Patent 9,354,017 B2

Case IPR2024-00524
Patent 9,909,831 B2

Before MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK, MITCHELL G. WEATHERLY, and ARTHUR M. PESLAK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PESLAK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Petitoner's Owner's Unopposed Motion to Seal
37 C.F.R. § 42.14

---

[1] We use this caption to dispose of substantially similar motions filed in each referenced case for convenience. The parties are not authorized to use this caption in subsequent filings. The cases have not been consolidated or joined.

On March 6, 2025, Petitioner filed an Unopposed Motion to Seal Petitioner's Reply, Paper 25, Mr. Hoff's deposition transcript, Exhibit 1016, and Mr. McPherson's deposition transcript, Exhibit 1017. ("Mot." or "Motion"). Paper 23, 1.[2] Petitioner filed publicly available redacted versions of the Petitioner Reply (Paper 24), Exhibit 1016, and Exhibit 1017.

For the following reasons, we grant the Motion to Seal.

A party moving to seal must show "good cause" for the relief requested. 37 C.F.R. § 42.54(a). There is a strong public policy that favors making information filed in *inter partes* review proceedings open to the public. *See Garmin Int'l v. Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC*, Case IPR2012-00001 (PTAB March 14, 2013) (Paper 34) (discussing the standards the Board applies to motions to seal). The moving party bears the burden of showing that the relief requested should be granted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).

> "Good cause" for sealing is established by a "sufficient explanation as to why" the "information sought to be sealed is confidential information", a demonstration that the information is not "excessively redacted", and a showing that, on balance, the strong "public[] interest in maintaining a complete and understandable record" is outweighed by "the harm to a party, by disclosure of information" and "the need of either party to rely specifically on the information at issue." Consequently, a movant to seal must demonstrate adequately that (1) the information sought to be sealed is truly confidential, (2) a

[2] We refer to documents filed in IPR2024-00522. Substantially similar documents were filed in IPR2024-00523 and IPR2024-00524.

> 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 Pharms. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd., Case IPR2017-01053 (PTAB January 19, 2018) (Paper 27) (informative), at 3–4 (citations omitted).

Petitioner argues that the Petitioner Reply "cites to and quotes from three documents which Patent Owner contends include confidential information", i.e., Exhibit 1016, Exhibit 1017, and Exhibit 2016. Mot. 1. In support of the Motion, Petitioner refers us to the reasons set forth in Patent Owner's Motion to Seal Mr. Hoff's Declaration Exhibit 2016. *Id.* (citing Paper 14).

We have reviewed the documents Petitioner moves to seal and the redacted versions of those documents. We find that the publicly available documents are not overly redacted.

In an order to be entered coincident with this Order, we find that Patent Owner established good cause for sealing Exhibit 2016. Because the information at issue here concerns the same underlying information and implicates the same confidentiality concerns at issue in Patent Owner's Motion to Seal Exhibit 2016, we find good cause exists to seal the Petitioner Reply, Exhibit 1016, and Exhibit 1017.

Therefore, it is hereby;

ORDERED that the Motion to Seal Petitioner's Reply (Paper 25) is granted, and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion to Seal Exhibit 1016 and Exhibit 1017 is granted.

For PETITIONER:

Adam Seitz
Adam Sandwell
Chris Schmidt
ERISE IP, P.A.
adam.seitz@eriseip.com
adam.sandwell@eriseip.com
chris.schmidt@eriseip.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Joshua Griswold
Kenneth Hoover
Carl Bruce
Matthew Colvin
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
griswold@fr.com
hoover@fr.com
bruce@fr.com
colvin@fr.com