PUBLIC VERSION

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.
Petitioner,
v.

GREENTHREAD, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00553
U.S. Patent No. 11,316,014

PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(B)(2)(I)

[redacted]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 3

A. Prior Litigation Involving the Challenged Patents 3

1. Intel-[redacted] Litigation 3

2. Greenthread's Licenses to Intel and [redacted] 4

B. Petitioner's IPR Proceedings 5

C. Petitioner's Relationship with Patent Owner's Licensees and the Current and Co-Pending Proceedings 6

D. Petitioner's Relationship with with other Petitioners in Co-Pending Proceedings 7

III. THE REQUESTED DISCOVERY 9

IV. THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE SUPPORT GRANTING THE REQUESTED DISCOVERY 9

A. There is More Than a Possibility or Mere Allegation That the Requested Discovery Will Yield Useful Information 10

B. The Second *Garmin* Factor Favors PO 13

C. The Requested Information Is Not Reasonably Available Through Other Means 13

D. The Requests Are Easily Understandable 14

E. The Requests Are Not Overly Burdensome 14

V. TIMING OF DISCOVERY RESPONSES 15

VI. CONCLUSION 15

[redacted]

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Bungie Inc. v. Worlds Inc.,
IPR2015-01264, Paper 64 (PTAB Jan. 14, 2020) 12

Ford Motor Co. v. Neo Wireless LLC,
IPR2023-00763, Paper No. 28 (PTAB March 22, 2024) 10

Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC,
IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 (PTAB Mar. 5, 2013) 9, 10, 13

General Plastic Industrial Co. Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha,
IPR2016-01357-31, Paper No. 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017) .....passim

Herrion v. Children's Hosp. Nat. Med. Ctr.,
448 F. App'x 71 (D.C. Cir. 2011).....12

In re Google LLC,
949 F.3d 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2020) 12

Mitek Sys., Inc. v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n,
IPR2020-00882, 2020 WL 3884733 (PTAB July 9, 2020).....10

Taylor v. Sturgell,
553 U.S. 880 (2008).....1, 11, 12

Valve Corp. v. Elec. Scripting Prods., Inc.,
IPR2019-00062, Paper 11 (Apr. 2, 2019).....10

Ventex Co. v. Columbia Sportswear North America, Inc.,
IPR2017-00651, Paper 148 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019) 11, 12, 13

WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.,
889 F.3d 1308 (Fed. Cir. 2018) 11

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. §315(b) 5, 9, 14

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2)(i) 1

[redacted]

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
Ex. 2001	*Greenthread, LLC v. Intel Corp.*, No. 6:22-cv-00105-ADA, Dkt. 1 (Complaint) (W.D. Tex. Jan. 27, 2022)
Ex. 2002	[RESERVED]
Ex. 2003	*Greenthread, LLC v. Intel Corp.*, 6:22-cv-00105-ADA, Dkt. 38 (First Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement) (W.D. Tex., filed Apr. 29, 2022)
Ex. 2004	*Greenthread, LLC v. Intel Corp.*, No. 6:22-cv-00105-ADA, Dkt. 113 (Redacted Memorandum Opinion and Order) (W.D. Tex. Dec. 27, 2022)
Ex. 2005	*Greenthread, LLC v. Intel Corp.*, 6:22-cv-00105-ADA, Dkt. 38-8 (Greenthread's Amended Preliminary Infringement Contentions) (W.D. Tex., filed Apr. 29, 2022)
Ex. 2006	*Greenthread, LLC v. Intel Corp.*, 6:22-cv-00105-ADA, Dkt. 38-12 (Exs. D-1, D-2, D-3, D-6 to Greenthread's Preliminary Infringement Contentions) (W.D. Tex., filed Apr. 29, 2022)
Ex. 2007	*Greenthread, LLC v. Intel Corp.*, 6:22-cv-00105-ADA, Dkt. 49 (Notice of Appearance of Additional Counsel) (W.D. Tex., filed June 9, 2022)
Ex. 2008	Petition (Paper 1) in *Sony Group Corp. v. Greenthread, LLC*, IPR2023-00376
Ex. 2009	*Greenthread, LLC v. Dell Inc.*, No. 6:22-cv-105-ADA, Dkt. 120 (Second Amended Complaint)
Ex. 2010	*Greenthread, LLC v. Intel Corp.*, 6:22-cv-00105-ADA, Dkt. 135 (Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice of L. Popovski on Behalf of Sony) (W.D. Tex., filed January 30, 2023)
Ex. 2011	[SEALED] Confidential agreement
Ex. 2012	[SEALED] Confidential declaration

[redacted]

Exhibit No.	Description
Ex. 2013	February 5, 2024 Neil Ozarkar email to the counsel regarding IPR2014-00468, -00469, -00470
Ex. 2014	February 21, 2024 Miguel Bombach email to counsel regarding IPR2014-00468, -00469, -00470
Ex. 2015	May 10, 2024 Neil Ozarkar email to the Board regarding IPR2014-00550, -00551, -00552, -00553
Ex. 2016	Greenthread's December 13, 2023 Preliminary Infringement Contentions to Monolithic
Ex. 2017	Monolithic Power Systems, Inc., Investor/Analyst Day 2018 Presentation
Ex. 2018	Monolithic Power Systemts, Inc. Q2 2021 Earnings Call Transcript
Ex. 2019	Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. Data Sheet MP2953B Intel VR12.5 Compliant Controller
Ex. 2020	Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. LinkedIn post regarding Sony PlayStation 5
Ex. 2021	May 2, 2015 Investor's Business Daily, "Sony PlayStation 4 Chipmaker Monolithic Power Systems Tops Q1 Views"
Ex. 2022	Monolithic Power Systems, Inc. 2023 Form 10-K

[redacted]

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner Greenthread, LLC ("PO") submits this Motion for Additional Discovery pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(b)(2)(i) and as authorized by the Board via email on May 29, 2024. Petitioner has an extensive relationship with time-barred parties Intel and [redacted][1] Among other things, Petitioner manufactures and designs components of products accused in prior litigation against those parties.

Petitioner wants to take inconsistent positions before the Board and in district court. On one hand, ***before the Board***, Petitioner claims it is not in privity with Intel and [redacted] (collectivily "Licensees") each of whom have a license ("Licenses") to the Challenged Patents. On the other hand, ***in district court***, Petitioner wants to have the benefit of the Licenses to reduce potential damages. Petitioner refuses to say whether it plans to raise a license defense in district court (at least until these IPRs are instituted). If Petitioner claims the benefit of the Licenses, then it is Licensees' sublicensee and exercising Licensee's rights. That puts Petitioner in privity. *See Taylor v. Sturgell*, 553 U.S. 880 (2008). It is unfair for Petitioner to cloak itself in Licensees' legal rights, while disclaiming privity.

---

[1] The Intel and [redacted] entities and Challenged Patents are identified in the Definitions section of the proposed discovery requests provided at Appendix A.

[redacted]

It is also unfair and contrary to Board precedent to allow Petitioner to engage in sequential attacks and follow-on *inter partes* review petitions. Petitioner is a party to a Joint Defense Group ("JDG") in the current district court litigations that shared and copied the **same** invalidity contentions. This includes defendants Semiconductor Components Industries ("onsemi"), OmniVision Technologies ("OV"), and Cirrus Logic, Inc. ("Cirrus"), each of which has filed IPR petitions against Greenthread's Challenged Patents. Greenthread has filed preliminary responses in **ten of the fourteen IPR petitions** filed by those petitioners. Those petitions challenging the **same** claims using identical or nearly identical as challenged by Petitioner. Petitioner waited until 1) **after** onsemi filed 2) after OV and Cirrus filed, and 3) **well-after** PO's POPRs in **ten out of fourteen** of those proceedings to file this follow-on petition. These multiple, staggered petitions challenging the **same** patents claims are harassment and prejudicial to PO.

PO's proposed discovery is narrowly tailored to address Petitioner's relationships with Licensees and to cut through the unfairness of Petitioner's gamesmanship. First, PO requests Petitioner's agreements and communications with Licensees relating to the products they sell or manufacture for them. Second, PO seeks to pose one interrogatory striking at the heart of the privity inquiry—whether Petitioner intends to claim in district court the benefit of the Licenses. Third, PO seeks Petitioner's communications and agreements relating to the JDG to

[redacted]

establish whether the *General Plastic* factors are met. The requested additional discovery is therefore in the interests of justice.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Prior Litigation Involving the Challenged Patents

1. Intel-[redacted] Litigation

On February 1, 2022, Greenthread filed a complaint against Intel and [redacted] for infringement of the Challenged Patents, except the '014 patent. Ex. 2001, 1-4. After the '014 issued, Greenthread filed a First Amended Complaint against both parties, which it served on April 29, 2022. Ex. 2003. The original case against Intel and [redacted] was severed and the case against Intel was transferred from the Western District of Texas to the District of Oregon. Ex. 2004, 22. The [redacted] litigation remained in Texas and continued in parallel with the *Intel* litigation.

[redacted] was a real-party-in-interest to the [redacted] litigation. Greenthread's allegations in the First Amended Complaint against [redacted] were based on, among other things, [redacted] components in [redacted] products. Ex. 2003, ¶¶18, 60, 76-81; Ex. 2005, 8 ([redacted] Accused Products"), 18-20 (section entitled [redacted] Accused Products"); Ex. 2006, 1-34. After PO accused [redacted] products, additional counsel stepped in to represent [redacted] with respect to [redacted] products. Ex. 2007. [redacted] then filed its own IPRs against the Challenged Patents, which had been asserted against [redacted] products. Ex. 2008. The [redacted] petition named [redacted] as a real-party-in-interest.

[redacted]

Ex. 2008, 7. Afterwards, PO added [redacted] as a party to [redacted] litigation. Ex. 2009. After [redacted] was added to the case, [redacted] counsel for [redacted] products appeared in the case for [redacted] Ex. 2010. The parties ultimately settled their disputes.

2. Greenthread's Licenses to Intel and [redacted]

As part of the settlements, Greenthread granted Intel and [redacted] releases for past infringement and a license to Greenthread's patents, by way of sublicense through RPX. Ex. 2011, 2. Greenthread signed the agreement, licensing Intel and [redacted] on April 7, 2023. *Id*. In another proceeding, RPX submitted an affidavit stating: "By operation of their membership agreements with RPX, Intel and [redacted] acquired the full scope of sublicensable rights Greenthread granted to RPX at the time the RPX-Greenthread Agreement was executed." Ex. 2012.

The Licenses grant Licensees the right "to make, have made, use, have used, sell, … offer for sale, have offered for sale, have sold, … import, have imported, … and otherwise exploit or dispose of any Licensed Product and Service." Ex. 2011, 2 (definition of "Patent License"); Ex. 2012. The Licenses define "Licensed Product and Service" to include "any product … made, have made, used, purchased, provided, … or otherwise exploited or disposed of by or on behalf of" Licensees. Ex. 2011, 2. The License covers all Challenged Patents. *See id.*, 3 ("'Patents' shall mean …."). Accordingly, "any product" Licensees "have made" by any Petitioner

or "purchase" from Petitioner is a "Licensed Product or Service" which Licensees have the right to "use, … sell, … obtain, … and otherwise exploit." *Id.*, 2-3.

B. Petitioner's IPR Proceedings

On February 3, 2024, Petitioner filed the first petition in these proceedings, IPR2024-00468 ('195 patent). The -00468 petition contains no evidence or explanation regarding its timeliness and § 315(b), just the bald statement that Petitioner is not barred or estopped from requesting IPR. IPR2024-00468, Paper 1, §III. IPR2024-00469 ('502 patent) and -00470 ('222 patent) were filed on the same date with the same bald statement.[2] Two days later, Greenthread informed Petitioner that it "may be operating, in part, under" the Licenses and that "the petitions are [therefore] time barred." Ex. 2013. Greenthread requested that Petitioners withdraw their petitions or at a minimum provide discovery into whether the petitions are time

[2] Monolithic has filed seven IPRs against Greenthread's Challenged Patents. The first three IPRs, IPR2024-00468, IPR2024-00469, and IPR2024-00470, were filed in Februrary as noted. The remaining four IPRs, IPR2024-00550 ('842 patent), IPR2024-00551 ('481 patent), IPR2024-00552 ('222 patent), and IPR2024-00553 ('014 patent), which includes the instant IPR, were all filed on March 18, 2024. Each of the four later-filed IPRs contain the identical statement regarding timeliness and § 315(b) as the original three petitions.

[redacted]

barred. *Id*. On February 6, 2024, Petitioner responded refusing to withdraw the petitions or provide any discovery. Ex. 2014. On May 10, 2024, Greenthread emailed the Board "to request authorization to file a motion for additional discovery," and providing both parties' positions on the request. Ex. 2015. On May 29, the Board authorized this motion.

C. Petitioner's Relationship with Patent Owner's Licensees and the Current and Co-Pending Proceedings

On May 26, 2023, Greenthread filed a complaint in the U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware alleging that Petitioner infringes each of the Challenged Patents. Greenthread has served only preliminary infringement contentions in the district court. Ex. 2016. The case is stayed, and Petitioner has not provided discovery regarding the infringing products.

Public information, however, confirms that Petitioner's chips are incorporated into Intel and [redacted] products. For instance, Petitioner announced during Investor/Analyst Day in 2018 that its technology would be used in Intel processors. Ex. 2017, 18. Petitioner's Q2 2021 earnings call referred to its success including its technology in Intel products. Ex. 2018, 5. Petitioner's MP2953B is a digital multi-phase controller that provides power for the core of the Intel VR12.5 platform. Ex. 2019. Publicly-available information also confirms that Petitioner is a chip supplier for [redacted]. Ex. 2020, 2021.

D. Petitioner's Relationship with with other Petitioners in Co-Pending Proceedings

Petitioner has not denied that it is in a joint defense group with other Petitioners of co-pending IPR proceedings, including On Semiconductor Corporation, d/b/a Semiconductor Components Industries, LLC ("onsemi"), Texas Instruments ("TI"), OmniVision Technologies ("OV"), and Cirrus Logic, Inc. ("Cirrus"), each of which has been served with a complaint alleging infringement of Greenthread's Challenged Patents. Subsequently, each has filed IPR petitions against Greenthread's Challenged Patents.

Petitioner served invalidity contentions that referenced invalidity contentions prepared by defendants in other district court cases, including defendant onsemi and using the same Bates number identifications from the prior cases in the Eastern District of Texas. Petitioner's invalidity contentions further have copied and included highly sensitive source code/process information from TI, indicating that the petitioners of the various IPRs are sharing confidential information and coordinating strategy.[3]

[3] To the extent that it would be helpful for the Board to view the invalidity contentions, including the highly sensitive source code/process information from TI, PO would be willing to request permission from TI and Petitioner to submit TI's

[redacted]

On July 27, 2023, onSemi filed three IPRs: IPR2023-01242 ('222 patent), IPR2023-01243 ('842 patent), and IPR2023-01244 ('222 patent). Greenthread filed its POPR for each IPR on November 14, 2023. The Board instituted the IPRs on February 12, 2024. On December 11, 2023, onSemi filed four additional IPRs: IPR2024-00263 ('014 patent), IPR2024-00264 ('481 patent), IPR2024-00265 ('502 patent), and IPR2024-00266 ('195 patent). Greenthread filed its POPRs each of these IPRs on May 8, 2024.

Cirrus and OV jointly filed seven IPRs: IPR2024-00016 ('842 patent) on October 11, 2023, IPR2024-0001 ('481 patent) on October 12, 2023, IPR2024-00017 ('195 patent) on October 18, 2023, and IPR2024-00018 ('502 patent), IPR2024-00019 ('014 patent), IPR2024-00020 ('222 patent) and IPR-2024-00021 ('222 patent) on October 27, 2023. Greenthead's POPRs were filed on January 24, 2024 (IPR2024-00016, -00001) and February 7, 2024 (IPR2024-00017 – 00021).

Each of the pending petitions for the Challenged Patents rely on the same prior art as Petitioner.

---

source code information from the invalidity contentions under seal in this proceeding.

[redacted]

III. THE REQUESTED DISCOVERY

PO requests discovery that goes to the status of this Petition as a serial attack on Greenthread and the status of Licensees as RPIs and/or privies of Petitioner. If Petitioner is coordinating with the other defendants, institution should be denied under *General Plastic*. If Intel or [redacted] is deemed an RPI or privy of Petitioner, this petition is time-barred by 35 U.S.C. §315(b). Specifically, PO seeks discovery regarding (summarized; *see* Appendix A):

> 1. Agreements between i) Petitioner and/or its affiliates and ii) a Licensee (or their affiliates), relating to the products that Petitioner and/or its affiliates sells to, manufactures for, or designs with or for, Licensees.
>
> 2. All communications between i) any Petitioner and/or its affiliates and ii) any Licensee (or their affiliates), relating to Patent Owner or the products that Petitioner and/or its affiliates sells, makes, or designs to, for, or with any Licensee or [redacted]
>
> 3. Whether Petitioner's activities are licensed or exhaust PO's rights.
>
> 4. Communications and agreements related to the JDG or coordination between Petitioner (or its affiliates) and other current or former petitioners that have filed IPR petitions against Greenthread.

IV. THE INTERESTS OF JUSTICE SUPPORT GRANTING THE REQUESTED DISCOVERY

The Board applies the five-factor "necessary in the interest of justice" standard ("the *Garmin* factors") regarding motions for additional discovery. *See*

Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC, IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 at 6–7 (PTAB Mar. 5, 2013).

A. There is More Than a Possibility or Mere Allegation That the Requested Discovery Will Yield Useful Information

Discovery regarding communications and agreements related to the work of the JDG or any coordination between Petitioner and other petitioners will yield relevant information regarding whether this petition is an improper serial attack under *General Plastic*. *See General Plastic Industrial Co. Ltd. v. Canon Kabushiki Kaisha*, IPR2016-01357-31, Paper No. 19 (PTAB Sept. 6, 2017) (precedential); *see also Valve Corp. v. Elec. Scripting Prods., Inc.*, IPR2019-00062, Paper 11 (Apr. 2, 2019) (precedential).

Petitioner does not deny that it is coordinating with other petitioners and defendants in a JDG. Greenthread seeks discovery regarding the extent of this coordination to show that Petitioner is voluntarily operating with the JDG.[4] Greenthread seeks this discovery to demonstrate that the prior petitions were coordinated, and Petitioner waited until after several other petitions were filed and Greenthread filed its POPR to file this IPR. The Board should grant Greenthread's motion for this reason. *See Mitek Sys., Inc. v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n,* IPR2020-

[4] This is in contrast to the facts in *Ford Motor Co. v. Neo Wireless LLC*, IPR2023-00763, Paper No. 28 (PTAB March 22, 2024).

00882, 2020 WL 3884733, at *1 (PTAB July 9, 2020) (granting discovery for information relevant to *General Plastic* factors).

The discovery will yield useful information regarding whether Petitioner and time-barred parties are privies. Whether two parties are privies with respect to one another is evaluated under the "common law" framework set forth in *Taylor. See WesternGeco LLC v. ION Geophysical Corp.*, 889 F.3d 1308, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2018). "[A] variety of pre-existing 'substantive legal relationship[s]' between" two parties can create privity. *Taylor*, 553 U.S. at 894 (alterations in original). Among them are when two parties are "preceding and succeeding owners of property" and when one party acts as the "agent" for the other. *Id.* at 894-95. "[A]greements directly related to the product accused of infringing the patent at issue in this proceeding" satisfy *Taylor's* "pre-existing substantive legal relationship" test. *Ventex Co. v. Columbia Sportswear North America, Inc.*, IPR2017-00651, Paper 148 at 12 (PTAB Jan. 24, 2019) (precedential)).

As stated above, Petitioners have extensive "pre-existing substantive legal relationship" with time-barred Licensees including by selling, making, and desiging products with or for Licensees. Petitioner's agreements and communications with Licensees will show the precise nature of those relationships. For example, Petitioner has said that its products "typically require a highly technical sales and applications engineering effort" and Petitioner maintains a staff of "applications

engineers who work directly with customers' engineers." Ex. 2022. "Work[ing] directly with" Licensees "engineers" indicates that Petitioner and Licensees may have an exclusive manufacturing agreement for some products and/or products are actually jointly designed. The panel found this type of relationship relevant in *Ventex*. IPR2017-00651, Paper 148 at 13. Additionally, when a party makes custom products it often includes IP "clearance" provisions that the panel found relevant in *Bungie Inc. v. Worlds Inc.*, IPR2015-01264, Paper 64 at 40 (PTAB Jan. 14, 2020).

Further, contracts to "[a]ssembl[e] equipment based on information and instructions provided by" another party are "suggestive of an agency relationship." *In re Google LLC*, 949 F.3d 1338, 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2020). It is well established that "agents and principals are in privity for res judicata purposes 'if the prior action concerned a matter within the agency.'" *Herrion v. Children's Hosp. Nat. Med. Ctr.*, 448 F. App'x 71, 73 (D.C. Cir. 2011). Petitioner's manufacturing of accused products for Licensees may be similar to the assembling of equipment in *Google* and thus establish an agency relationship and privity. Whether Petitioner contends that it is acting as "have made" vendors under the Licenses would also be relevant to whether Petitioner is Licensees' agent.

Further, confirmation of Petitioner's sales of accused products to Licensees would show that it and Licensees are "preceeding and succeeding owners of property," specifically accused or licensed or infringing goods. *Taylor*, 553 U.S. at

894. The sales information and agreements would also show that sales of products to Licensees are "have made" under the Licenses (even if Petitioner disputes that for now to avoid privity). That would make Petitioner the beneficiary of an agreement "directly related" to the accused products, i.e., the Licenses. *Ventex*, IPR2017-00651, Paper 148 at 13.

B. The Second *Garmin* Factor Favors PO

The first two discovery requests (requests for agreements and communications, *supra* Section III) do not seek litigation positions. To the extent Petitioner may contend that the third and fourth discovery requests (*id.*) seek Petitioner's litigation positions, PO seeks this discovery to prevent the manifest unfairness of Petitioner filing follow on petitions and taking directly contrary positions in two proceedings—i.e. arguing no privity here, but asserting a license defense in district court. It is essential that Petitioners provide this information ***now***, to prevent the unfairness of Petitioner's serial petition and changing its position ***later*** in district court. The Board should not allow Petitioner to gain an unfair advantage by saying one thing in district court and another thing at the PTAB.

C. The Requested Information Is Not Reasonably Available Through Other Means

The third *Garmin* factor favors granting the discovery requests. Most obviously, Greenthread is not a member of the JDG and clearly is not privy to the communications or agreements related to the work or coordination of the JDG.

Morevoer, whether Petitioner contends it is a "have made" vendor under a License is information only in its possession. Likewise, the precise nature of Petitioner's relationship with Licensees, and which products Petitioner sells to them can only be known by looking at the requested agreements and communications.

PO has investigated the RPI/privy issue to the extent possible via publicly available information and needs the information sought by the discovery requests to ascertain the exact nature of the relationship between Petitioner and the time-barred parties. Without discovery, PO cannot know, for example, if or how Petitioner and its customers collaborate on product design, which customers buy which products, and which of Petitioner's products are incorporated into which Licensee products.

Furthermore, institution is a threshold issue. IPR "may not be instituted if the petition" is untimely. 35 U.S.C. § 315(b). PO needs the information ***now*** **to prevent Petitioner's gamesmanship** and in connection with ***this proceeding***.

D. The Requests Are Easily Understandable

As set forth in Appendix A, the four discovery requests are straightforward.

E. The Requests Are Not Overly Burdensome

PO's requested discovery is limited to agreements and communications relating to products sold to time-barred parties, and whether Petitioner intends to claim the benefit of the Licenses, and agreements and communications related to the JDG. The narrowly-tailored nature of this discovery ensures that Petitioner will not

suffer an undue burden in complying with the requests. The first two requests are requests for specific types of agreements and communications. If Petitioner claims that these documents are too numerous to produce, it would only underscore the extent of its relationship with Licensees and the need for the documents.

Regarding the third request, Petitioner should be able to easily state whether or not it intends to claim the benefit of prior licenses, and its apparent unwillingness to confirm or deny this—or perhaps take inconsistent positions at the PTAB and in district court—cannot be attributed to burden. Finally, for the fourth request, if Petitioner claims that the documents are too numerous to produce, this underscores the extent of Petitioner's coordination with the others and supports denial of institution pursuant to *General Plastic*. Petitioner should not be able to shield this information under the guise of burden to prevent fair application of *General Plastic*.

V. TIMING OF DISCOVERY RESPONSES

If additional discovery is granted, PO requests that Petitioner be ordered to submit all the requested discovery immediately, because the POPRs will be due during the briefing of PO's motion.

VI. CONCLUSION

Therefore, the Board should grant the requested discovery.

Dated: June 12, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan Whitehurst/

Alan Whitehurst
Reg. No. 43,263
awhitehurst@mckoolsmith.com
Nicholas T. Matich
Reg. No. L1,373
nmatich@mckoolsmith.com
Arvind Jairam
Reg. No. 62,759
ajairam@mckoolsmith.com
Stuart McCommas
Reg. No. 71,834
smccommas@mckoolsmith.com
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
1999 K St. NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 370-8300
Facsimile: (202) 370-8344

Archis "Neil" Ozarkar
Reg. No. 71,265
nozarkar@mckoolsmith.com
McKool Smith, P.C.
600 Travis Street, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77002
Telephone: (713) 485-7300
Facsimile: (713) 485-7344

Counsel for Patent Owner

[redacted]

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of this **PATENT OWNER'S MOTION FOR ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.51(B)(2)(I)** has been served on Petitioner via email on the following counsel of record for Petitioner:

Miguel Bombach
Bing Ai
John D. Esterhay
John P. Schnurer
Brianna Kadjo
Runkun Jiang
PERKINS COIE LLP
11452 El Camino Real, Ste. 300
San Diego, California 92130-2080
T: (858) 720-5700

PerkinsServiceMPS-GreenthreadIPR@perkinscoie.com

Dated: June 12, 2024

By: */Alan Whitehurst/*
Alan Whitehurst, Reg. No. 43,263

[redacted]

APPENDIX A

PUBLIC VERSION

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MONOLITHIC POWER SYSTEMS, INC.
Petitioner,
v.

GREENTHREAD, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00553
U.S. Patent No. 11,316,014

PATENT OWNER'S PROPOSED DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO PETITIONER

[redacted]

INSTRUCTIONS

1. If you withhold information based on privilege, work product protection, common interest privilege, or other exemption from discovery, provide a privilege log stating the date, the type of information withheld (e.g., document, email, phone call) with a brief description, the participants/recipients, and for written communications, the author.

2. This should not be covered by any request, but just to be clear, any Petitioner does not need to log or produce communications solely between it and its litigation and/or IPR counsel.

DEFINITIONS

1. "Petitioner" means Petitioner or real party in interest to these proceedings.

2. "Intel" means Intel Corporation and/or its affiliates.

3. [redacted] means [redacted]

4. [redacted] means [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] their affiliates.

5. "Licensees" mean Intel and [redacted] (individually "Licensee").

6. "Challenged Patents" means any patent challenged in these proceedings, including U.S. Patent Nos. 8,421,195; 9,190,502; 10,510,842; 10,734,481; 11,121,222; and 11,316,014.

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

Request for Production No. 1

All agreements between i) any Petitioner and/or its affiliates and ii) any Licensee or [redacted] (or their affiliates), relating to the products that Petitioner and/or its affiliates sells, makes, or designs to, for, or with any Licensee or [redacted] including sales contracts, purchase orders, and design agreements.

Request for Production No. 2

All communications between i) any Petitioner and/or its affiliates and ii) any Licensee or [redacted] (or their affiliates), relating to Patent Owner or the products that Petitioner and/or its affiliates sells, makes, or designs to, for, or with any Licensee or [redacted] including specifications, plans, drawings, (including drafts of the forgoing), test results, documents identifying the finished product into which Petitioner's

[redacted]

product is incorporated and any documents showing the involvement and/or role of Petitioner and/or Licensee or [redacted] with respect to the product, such as communications between engineers working for a Petitioner and engineers working for a Licensee.

Request for Production No. 3

All communications and agreements between i) Petitioner and/or its affiliates and ii) other current or former Petitioners that have filed IPR petitions against Greenthread's Challenged Patents relating to joint defense group work or coordination against Greenthread or its Challenged Patents.

INTERROGATORIES

Interrogatory No. 1

State whether any Petitioner contends that any of its activities are licensed to or exhaust Patent Owner's rights in a Challenged Patent.

Dated: June 12, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan Whitehurst/

Alan Whitehurst
Reg. No. 43,263
awhitehurst@mckoolsmith.com
Nicholas T. Matich
Reg. No. L1,373
nmatich@mckoolsmith.com
Arvind Jairam
Reg. No. 62,759
ajairam@mckoolsmith.com
Stuart McCommas
Reg. No. 71,834
smccommas@mckoolsmith.com
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
1999 K St. NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 370-8300
Facsimile: (202) 370-8344

Archis "Neil" Ozarkar
Reg. No. 71,265
nozarkar@mckoolsmith.com
McKool Smith, P.C.
600 Travis Street, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77002
Telephone: (713) 485-7300

Counsel for Patent Owner