
From: Adam Hollingsworth <hollingsworth@tsgadvisors.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 8:04:04 AM
To: Stewart, Coke <CokeM.Stewart@uspto.gov>
Cc: Danielle Alvarez <Danielle.alvarez@mercuryllc.com>
Subject: Re: Meeting request on ParkerVision PTAB proceedings

CAUTION: This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. **PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE** before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

Ms. Stewart — I just wanted to follow-up on our email below.


We would be grateful for any assistance you could provide.

The Media Tek v ParkerVision proceeding scheduled for the PTAB next week is a text book case of what your March 2025 policy guidance seeks to avoid.

Thanks so much for your consideration.

ADAM HOLLINGSWORTH

Adam-Hollingsworth-Name



 904.502.1802

 tsgadvisors.com

 hollingsworth@tsgadvisors.com

Insight creates impact. Let us show you how. [LinkedIn](#)

On Aug 27, 2025, at 6:09 PM, Adam Hollingsworth
<hollingsworth@tsgadvisors.com> wrote:

Acting Director Stewart,

Following a meeting Danielle Alvarez and I had with Stuart McCommas in the White House Counsel's Office, he kindly shared your contact information, for which we are grateful.

On behalf of ParkerVision, I am requesting a brief meeting with you ahead of the September 9–10 PTAB oral arguments in ParkerVision's IPR matters.

Our team would like to share why this case represents a textbook example of the issues your March 2025 policy guidance was designed to address: conserving Board resources, discouraging duplicative proceedings alongside active district court litigation, and safeguarding due-process integrity.

As you know, on July 29, 2025, the USPTO denied ParkerVision's request for leave to seek Director Review of seven institution decisions pending before the PTAB, citing untimeliness. While the request may have been procedurally untimely, it arose directly from your March 2025 memorandum, which for the first time created a policy framework that fits this matter squarely. In our view, this is exactly the type of extraordinary circumstance your policy contemplates.

The IPRs at issue are duplicative of litigation actively underway in the Western District of Texas, overseen by Judge Alan Albright, one of the most experienced patent jurists in the federal judiciary. Had your March 2025 policy been in place when these IPRs were filed, the matter would properly reside with the federal courts. Instead, ParkerVision finds itself trapped between outdated policy and the sound principles your office has since adopted.

If a discussion of this case is not possible, we would still welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss broader patent reform ideas consistent with your philosophy — reforms that could complement President Trump's economic agenda and strengthen American investment, manufacturing, and job creation.

Could we schedule 30 minutes at your convenience before the hearings? We will gladly adjust to your calendar and are willing to travel to Washington, D.C.

With appreciation for your March 2025 leadership on PTAB policy, and thank you for considering this request.

Best regards,

Adam Hollingsworth
904-502-1802

Adam-Hollingsworth-Name



904.502.1802



tsgadvisors.com



hollingsworth@tsgadvisors.com

Insight creates impact. Let us show you how. LinkedIn