

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC, CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.,
T-MOBILE USA, INC., SPRINT LLC F/K/A SPRINT CORP.,
and AT&T SERVICES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00942
IPR2024-00943¹
Patent 8,589,541 B2

Before HYUN J. JUNG, SCOTT B. HOWARD,
and STEPHEN E. BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HOWARD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

CONDUCT OF PROCEEDING
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

¹ This Order addresses issues that are the same in each of the above-identified proceedings. We issue one Order to be entered in each proceeding. The parties are not authorized to use this style caption unless later permitted.

IPR2024-00942 (Patent 8,589,541 B2)

IPR2024-00943 (Patent 8,589,541 B2)

On March 14, 2025, Google LLC, Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, Verizon Corporate Services Group Inc., T-Mobile USA, Inc., Sprint LLC f/k/a Sprint Corp., and AT&T Services, Inc. (collectively “Petitioner”) contacted the Board via email to request a conference to discuss the remaining due dates in light of the Patent Owner Response. *See* IPR2024-00942, Paper 12 (“PO Resp.”).² In the email, Petitioner stated that “Patent Owner filed a one-paragraph Patent Owner Response stating that Patent Owner has chosen to ‘not provide a substantive discussion of the Petition’s invalidity grounds.’” Petitioner also stated that “Patent Owner submitted no accompanying evidence, and neither party has made evidentiary objections.” After the email was sent and a conference call with the parties was scheduled, Petitioner filed a reply in each of the proceedings.

A conference call was held on March 19, 2025 among respective counsel for the parties and Judges Jung, Howard, and Belisle. During the call, we discussed various issues relating to the Scheduling Order. Patent Owner had not yet decided whether it was going to file a sur-reply, but indicated that it did not intend to request an oral hearing. Petitioner had not yet decided whether it would request an oral hearing. The Panel indicated that if the parties filed a paper indicating that neither party was requesting an oral hearing, the Panel would begin working on the final written decisions in due course.

We also ordered the parties to meet and confer and, within 10 business days (April 3, 2025), file a stipulation modifying the scheduling order by accelerating Due Date 3 (the due date for Patent Owner’s Sur-

² A substantially similar paper was filed in IPR2024-00943. For convenience, we only cite the paper submitted in IPR2024-00942.

IPR2024-00942 (Patent 8,589,541 B2)

IPR2024-00943 (Patent 8,589,541 B2)

reply) to no more than six weeks from the filing of the Petitioner's Reply (April 29, 2025). We also allowed the parties to agree to an earlier (but not later) date for Due Date 4 (July 23, 2025).

ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is:

ORDERED that the parties will meet and confer and, no later than April 3, 2025, file a stipulation changing Due Date 3 to a date no later than April 29, 2025; and

FURTHER ORDERED that, in that stipulation, the parties may further agree to change Due Date 4 to a date earlier than July 23, 2025.

IPR2024-00942 (Patent 8,589,541 B2)

IPR2024-00943 (Patent 8,589,541 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Erika H. Arner

Daniel C. Tucker

Alexander M. Boyer

Cara E. Regan

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,

GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP

erika.arner@finnegan.com

daniel.tucker@finnegan.com

alexander.boyer@finnegan.com

cara.regan@finnegan.com

Patrick D. McPherson

Kevin P. Anderson

DUANE MORRIS LLP

pdmcperson@duanemorris.com

kpanderson@duanemorris.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Reza Mirzaie

Dale Chang

James Milkey

Neil Rubin

Philip Wang

RUSS AUGUST & KABAT

rmirzaie@raklaw.com

dchang@raklaw.com

jmilkey@raklaw.com

nrubin@raklaw.com

pwang@raklaw.com