Paper No. ___
Filed: September 4, 2025

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WIZ, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ORCA SECURITY LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00865
Patent No. 11,693,685

PETITIONER'S MOTION TO SEAL

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Wiz, Inc. ("Wiz") respectfully requests that the confidential version of the Petitioner's Reply in Support of Motion to Exclude Evidence ("Reply") be sealed in accordance with the terms of the joint protective order (EX2161). Good cause exists to seal this document because it contains information previously designated confidential and filed under seal in this IPR and/or sensitive, non-public information that would significantly harm Wiz's competitive position if made public. The terms of the joint protective order were agreed-upon by the parties and have already been entered by the Board. Paper 37, 7. Based upon discussions during negotiation of the terms of the joint protective order, Wiz understands Patent Owner does not oppose this motion to seal.

II. GOVERNING RULES AND PTAB GUIDANCE

Under 35 U.S.C. §316(a)(1), the default rule is that all papers filed in an *inter partes* review are open and available for access by the public, but a party may file a concurrent motion to seal and the information at issue is sealed pending the outcome of the motion.

Similarly, 37 C.F.R. §42.14 provides:

> The record of a proceeding, including documents and things, shall be made available to the public, except as otherwise ordered. A party intending a document or thing to be sealed shall file a motion to seal concurrent with the filing of the document or thing to be sealed. The

> document or thing shall be provisionally sealed on the receipt of the motion and remain so pending the outcome of the decision on the motion.

Only "confidential information" is protected from disclosure. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(7) ("The Director shall prescribe regulations . . . providing for protective orders governing the exchange and submission of confidential information"). In this regard, the Office Trial Practice Guide, 84 Fed. Reg. 64280 (Nov. 21, 2019) provides:

> The rules aim to strike a balance between the public's interest in maintaining a complete and understandable file history and the parties' interest in protecting truly sensitive information.
>
> * * *
>
> *Confidential Information:* The rules identify confidential information in a manner consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1)(G), which provides for protective orders for trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information. 37 C.F.R. § 42.54.

III. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO SEAL THE CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

The Board's rules identify confidential information in a manner consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1)(G), which provides for protective orders for trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial

information. Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 84 Fed. Reg. 64280 (Nov. 21, 2019).

Good cause exists to seal the Reply. The Reply contains discussion of documents that contain sensitive technical and competitive information regarding Wiz's products and business operations, including information for which Wiz has confidentiality obligations to others. These documents have been previously designated confidential and filed under seal for this reason. The Board granted Patent Owner's motion to seal those documents (Paper 37), and this motion is consistent with maintaining those protections for that information. Wiz will file redacted version of the Reply after conferring with Patent Owner.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Petitioner respectfully requests the Board grant this motion to seal.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 4, 2025

/ Matthew A. Argenti /
Matthew A. Argenti, Lead Counsel
Reg. No. 61,836

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing Petitioner's Motion to Seal Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42 was served on this 4th day of September 2025, on the Patent Owner at the following electronic service addresses:

Christopher Henry
Raghav Bajaj
Kristina McKenna
Douglas E. Lumish
Blake R. Davis
Steven W. Peters
Lucas Lonergan
Nicole E. Bruner
Latham & Watkins LLP
christopher.henry@lw.com
raghav.bajaj@lw.com
krissy.mckenna@lw.com
doug.lumish@lw.com
blake.davis@lw.com
steven.peters@lw.com
lucas.lonergan@lw.com
nicole.bruner@lw.com

Date: September 4, 2025

/ Matthew A. Argenti /
Matthew A. Argenti, Lead Counsel
Reg. No. 61,836