

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MAXELL, LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00717
Patent 11,223,757 B2

Before NEIL T. POWELL, TERRENCE W. McMILLIN, and
KEVIN C. TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5(a)

On September 19, 2025, an “Order—Related Matters Update” (“Related Matters Order” (Paper 27)) was entered in this proceeding. The Related Matters Order provided:

The parties must keep the Board apprised of developments regarding adjudication of validity or patentability of the challenged patent claims, or substantially similar patent claims, such as claim construction, findings of fact, or conclusions of law, in “any other judicial or administrative matter that would affect, or be affected by, a decision in the proceeding” and is identified as a related matter under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2). The parties must alert the Board to any such developments within five business days, by sending an email to Trials@uspto.gov, and file in the docket of this proceeding relevant materials from the related matter(s).

Paper 27, 1–2. The Related Matters Order further provided that “the parties shall send a joint email to trials@uspto.gov providing developments in any related matter as set forth above within five business days (if the development has already occurred) or within five business days of the development occurring.” *Id.* at 2.

On September 26, 2025, the parties sent an email to the Board stating:

Pursuant to the order in the above-identified IPR, each of the parties believes that there is at least one responsive document, but disagree as to what those documents are. Petitioner believes that a sealed order dated May 2, 2025 is responsive because it concerns the construction of limitation [1.j] of the ’757 patent at issue in this IPR that was proposed by patent owner, and hereby requests authorization to file a motion for entry of the Board’s standard protective order so that petitioner may file the district courts’ order. Patent owner does not oppose this request.

Patent Owner requests authorization to file documents evidencing a finding of validity by the Office when considering all the prior art from petition (Chinn, Kim, Takahashi,

Yamamoto, EX-V7 User Guide) for related U.S. Patent No. 12,284,437 and file history. Petitioner opposes this request.

Ex. 3002.

The purpose of this Order is to respond to the September 26, 2025, email from the parties and to order additional related briefing to determine whether any materials from another proceeding should be submitted and considered by the Board.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's unopposed request for authorization to file a motion for entry of the Board's standard protective order is GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that, within three (3) days, Petitioner shall file the referenced Order dated May 2, 2025, in the form made publicly available as an exhibit in this proceeding. If a full and complete copy of said Order was not made publicly available, Petitioner shall further file, under seal and made available only to the parties and the Board, a full and complete copy of said Order; and

FURTHER ORDERED that within five (5) days, to the extent either party wishes to file additional materials in this proceeding, including Patent Owner's opposed request to file documents related to U.S. Patent 12,284,437, the party shall file a request for authorization to submit such additional materials by: (1) identifying the additional materials; (2) explaining how such additional materials are related to the patent claims being challenged in this proceeding, or substantially similar claims, that have been previously adjudicated, post-issuance, before the Office, in district court, or at the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC); and (3)

further explaining why such additional materials should be considered in this proceeding. Said request shall be limited to ten (10) pages (exclusive of any appendices). A response to said request for authorization may be filed by the opposing party within five (5) days thereafter and shall be limited to ten (10) pages (exclusive any appendices).

FOR PETITIONER:

Gianni Minutoli
James Heintz
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
Gianni.Minutoli@us.dlapiper.com
Jim.Heintz@us.dlapiper.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Robert G. Pluta
Amanda S. Bonner
Saqib J. Siddiqui
MAYER BROWN LLP
rpluta@mayerbrown.com
asbonner@mayerbrown.com
ssiddiqui@mayerbrown.com