UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INC.,
and NXP USA, INC.,
Petitioners

v.

PARKERVISION, INC.,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2024-00936[1]
Patent 9,118,528

PETITIONER'S MOTION TO SEAL

---

[1] NXP USA, Inc., who filed a petition in IPR2024-01068, is joined as petitioner in this proceeding.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.14, this Motion moves to seal Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude.

Patent Owner has previously filed a Motion to Seal moving for entry of the Board's Default Protective Order and to seal the Patent Owner's Response to Petition and certain exhibits filed therewith. Paper 20. Petitioner did not oppose Patent Owner's motion, and Petitioner continues to take no position about whether the material submitted by Patent Owner warrants sealing and entry of a protective order.

Nonetheless, because Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude describes and refers to material that Patent Owner moved to seal, Petitioner respectfully submits this Motion to Seal Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude, which is marked confidential and submitted with this Motion.

I. DOCUMENTS REQUESTED TO BE SEALED

Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude discusses the material that Patent Owner sought to be sealed and subject to the Default Protective Order in Motion to Seals filed by Patent Owner. Paper 20, (seeking to seal Patent Owner's Response and Exhibits 2010-2016, 2021-2022, 2024, 2027, 2029, and 2036).

II. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO SEAL

There is good cause to seal Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude because it refers to and describes material that Patent Owner represented as being its confidential business information in its prior Motion to Seal. Patent Owner's arguments in support of its Motion to Seal apply equally to Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude.

III. CERTIFICATION OF NON-PUBLICATION

Patent Owner certified that the information it sought to seal by its previous Motion had not been made publicly available, and Petitioner has no further knowledge of the information at issue being made publicly available.

IV. PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER

Patent Owner previously requested entry of the Default Protective Order. To the extent the Board grants Patent Owner's prior Motion to Seal, Petitioner submits that the material identified in this Motion to Seal should be subject to the same Default Protective order and identified as "PROTECTIVE ORDER MATERIAL."

V. CONCLUSION

For these reasons, Petitioner request sealing Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Exclude.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated August 19, 2025

/Yao Wang/

Joshua A. Griswold, Reg. No. 46,310
Rishi Gupta, Reg. No. 64,768
Yao Wang, Reg. No. 61,757
Patrick J. Bisenius, Reg. No. 63,893
W. Karl Renner, Reg. No. 41,265
Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
T: 202-783-5070
F: 877-769-7945
IPR12189-0092IP1@fr.com

Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 42.6(e)(1) and 42.6(e)(4)(iii), the undersigned certifies that on August 19, 2025, a complete and entire copy of this Petitioner's Motion to Seal and accompanying document were provided by email to the Patent Owner by serving the email correspondence address of record as follows:

Jason S. Charkow
Richard Juang
Chandran B. Iyer
Ronald M. Daignault
Stephanie Mandir
DAIGNAULT IYER LLP
8229 Boone Boulevard, Suite 450
Vienna, VA 22182

Email: pvlit@daignaultiyer.com

Attorneys for Patent Owner

/Li Feng/

Li Feng
Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
lfeng@fr.com