Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 81
Date: April 7, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GREENTHREAD, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00551
Patent 10,734,481 B2

Before KRISTEN L. DROESCH, GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN, and DONNA M. PRAISS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

OBERMANN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

Granting Patent Owner's Motions to Seal;
Granting Petitioner's 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 filed three Motions to Seal on, respectively, September 25, 2024, January 9, 2025, and May 9, 2025. Papers 24 (styled Renewed Motion to Seal), 33, 46. Petitioner filed no oppositions to these Motions.

Petitioner filed two Motions to Seal on September 25, 2024, and a third Motion to Seal on April 3, 2025. Papers 20, 22, 37. Patent Owner filed no oppositions to these Motions.

On September 25, 2024, Patent Owner filed a Motion for Entry of Protective Order, which includes Patent Owner's proposed modified Protective Order as Appendix A and a redline comparison between Patent Owner's proposed modified Protective Order and the Board's default protective order as Appendix B. Paper 24. Patent Owner represents that Petitioner does not oppose Patent Owner's Motion for Entry of Protective Order. *Id*. at 1.

On May 28, 2025, the Board issued an Order authorizing the parties to file redacted versions of documents they wish to seal that are already the subject of a motion to seal, and requesting the parties to jointly file a chart 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. Paper 51, 3–4.

Pursuant to the Board's May 28, 2025 Order (Paper 51), on June 11, 2025, the parties jointly submitted a chart (reproduced below) "that identifies all unresolved motion(s) to seal, the corresponding document(s)

(papers or exhibits) sought to be sealed by these motions, the information sought to be sealed, and the status of any redacted versions of those document(s)" in this proceeding. Paper 53, 2–3.

Undecided Motion to Seal	Document(s) Sought to be Sealed	Redacted Version / Status	Information Sought to be Sealed
Paper 20	Paper 9 (Petitioner's Response to PO's Discovery Motion)	Paper 21	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies
Paper 22	Paper 17 (Petitioner's Preliminary Reply)	Paper 23	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies
Paper 24	Paper 7 (PO Motion for Additional Discovery)	Paper 14	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies and Product Names
	Paper 12 (PO Preliminary Response)	Paper 15	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies and Product Names
	Ex. 2011 (Confidential agreement)	[REDACTED] Ex. 2011	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies/Names of Litigants in District Court Proceedings
	Ex. 2012 (Confidential declaration)	[REDACTED] Ex. 2012	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies
Paper 33	Paper 34 (PO Response)	x	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies
	Ex. 2034 (Confidential agreement)	x	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies
	Ex. 2072 (Declaration of Dr. Mohan Rao)	x	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies
Paper 37	Paper 38 (Petitioner's Reply)	x	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies
Paper 46	Paper 47 (PO Sur-reply)	Paper 48	Licensees/Names of Potential Privies

Paper 53, 2–3. The parties concurrently filed the redacted documents denoted with an "x". *See* Paper 53, 3; Papers 54, 55; Ex. 2034 (redacted version), Ex. 2072 (redacted version).

Subsequently, Patent Owner filed two further Motions to Seal (Papers 64, 72) seeking to seal its concurrently filed Supplemental Brief Concerning Board-Ordered Discovery (Paper 65) and Patent Owner's Demonstratives (Ex. 2088), respectively. Patent Owner also filed redacted versions of Paper 65 and Exhibit 2088. Paper 67, Ex. 2088 (redacted version).

Subsequently, Petitioner also filed a further Motion to Seal (Paper 74) seeking to seal its concurrently filed Petitioner's Objections to Patent Owner's Demonstratives (Paper 75). Petitioner, however, did not file a proposed redacted version of Paper 75.[1]

For the reasons that follow, we (1) *grant* Patent Owner's Motions to Seal (Papers 24, 33, 46, 64, 72) as to Papers 7, 12, 34, 47, 65; Exhibits 2011, 2012, 2034, 2072, 2088; (2) *grant* Petitioner's Motions to Seal (Papers 20, 22, 37, 74) as to Papers 9, 17, 38, 75; (3) grant Patent Owner's Motion for Entry of Protective Order (Paper 24); and (4) *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,

[1] Petitioner shall file a redacted version of Paper 75 within five (5) business days of this Order.

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. § 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 the parties' Motions to Seal, we are persuaded that good cause exists to seal the unredacted versions of the papers and exhibits

identified in the parties' Motions. *See* Papers 7, 9, 12, 17, 34, 38, 47, 65, 75, Ex. 2011 (sealed version), Ex. 2012 (sealed version), Ex. 2034 (sealed version), Ex. 2072 (sealed version), Ex. 2088 (sealed version). The parties have narrowly tailored the redacted portions of each paper and exhibit so as to protect sensitive or otherwise confidential information while balancing the public interest in an open record. *See* Papers 14, 15, 21, 23, 48, 53–55, 67, Ex. 2011 (redacted version), Ex. 2012 (redacted version), Ex. 2034 (redacted version), Ex. 2072 (redacted version), Ex. 2088 (redacted version). To bring order to this proceeding, and to account for the missing redacted version of Paper 75, Petitioner shall file a redacted version of Paper 75 within five (5) business days of this Order.

Accordingly, we *grant* the parties' Motions to Seal (Papers 20, 22, 24, 33, 37, 46, 64, 72, 74).

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. Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide 19–20, 107 (Nov. 2019) ("Trial Practice Guide").[2] The Trial Practice Guide sets forth specific guidelines on proposing a protective order and provides a Default Protective Order. *See* Trial Practice Guide 19–20, 107–122. The parties may

[2] Available at https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/tpgnov.pdf?MURL=TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated.

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 115. 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.* at 115–116.

Patent Owner seeks to modify the Board's Default Protective Order to add an additional category of "Attorneys' Eyes Only" material that is more sensitive than materials in the "Confidential" category and "whose disclosure to in-house counsel of an opposing party would create a substantial risk of serious harm." Paper 24, App. A at 1. Patent Owner designates Exhibits 2011 and 2012 as "PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL/OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" as they "contain highly competitively sensitive information related to licensing." Paper 24, 3. Patent Owner also designates Exhibits 2034 and 2072 as "PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL/ATTORNEYS' EYES ONLY" as they "contain highly competitively sensitive information related to licensing., including precise license terms and rates." Paper 33, 2.

We observe that the modified Protective Order differs from the Default Protective Order in that it provides an additional category of confidential information. Paper 24, 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.

IV. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions to Seal (Papers 24, 33, 46, 64, and 72) are *granted* with respect to Papers 7, 12, 34, 47, 65, and Exhibits 2011, 2012, 2034, 2072, and 2088 in the above-captioned proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions to Seal (Papers 20, 22, 37, and 74) are *granted* with respect to Papers 9, 17, 38, and 75 in the above-captioned proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that, within five (5) business days of this Order, Petitioner shall file a *redacted* version of Paper 75;[3]

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motion for Entry of Modified Protective Order (Paper 24) is *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the modified Protective Order (Appendix A of Paper 24) is entered in the above-captioned proceeding.

[3] 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 within five (5) business days of this Order a corrected redacted version of Exhibit 2088 to address this issue.

IPR2024-00551
Patent 10,734,481 B2

PETITIONER:

Miguel Bombach
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
miguel.bombach@foley.com

Bing Ai
John Esterhay
John Schnurer
Brianna Kadjo
Justin Jiang
PERKINS COIE LLP
ai-ptab@perkinscoie.com
esterhay-ptab@perkinscoie.com
schnurer-ptab@perkinscoie.com
kadjo-ptab@perkinscoie.com
jiang-ptab@perkinscoie.com

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
shejny@mckoolsmith.com