

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ANKER INNOVATIONS LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

POWERMAT TECHNOLOGIES LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-00995 (Patent 9,083,204 B2)
IPR2024-00996 (Patent 8,626,461 B2)

GRANT OF GOOD CAUSE EXTENSION
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11); 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c)

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11), “the final determination in an inter partes review [shall] be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a review under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months” The Director has delegated the authority to extend the one-year period to the Chief Administrative Patent

IPR2024-00995 (Patent 9,083,204 B2)

IPR2024-00996 (Patent 8,626,461 B2)

Judge. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c) (2024). In particular, 37 C.F.R.

§ 42.100(c) provides:

An inter partes review proceeding shall be administered such that pendency before the Board after institution is normally no more than one year. The time can be extended by up to six months for good cause by the Chief Administrative Patent Judge

In the absence of any extension, final written decisions resolving these proceedings would be due no later than February 20, 2026. 35 U.S.C.

§ 316(a)(11) (final written decision presumptively due no later than one year after entry of decision on institution); IPR2024-00995, Paper 7 (Decision on Institution, dated February 20, 2025); IPR2024-00996, Paper 7 (same).

On February 3, 2026, the parties notified the Board by email that they have reached an agreement in principle to settle these proceedings and jointly request a thirty-day extension of the deadline imposed by 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11). The parties represent that they have been working to finalize a settlement agreement but will need additional time to do so and to seek authorization from the Board to file a joint motion to terminate the proceedings once the settlement agreement is finalized.

Under the circumstances presented, the Chief Administrative Patent Judge determines that extending the deadline for the final written decisions will promote efficient resolution of the subject proceedings and, accordingly, that good cause exists in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c) to extend the one-year period for issuing a final written decision in each case.



Digitally signed by
Users, Deshpande,
Kalyan
Date: 2026.02.06
08:27:57 -05'00'

Kalyan K. Deshpande
Chief Administrative Patent Judge

IPR2024-00995 (Patent 9,083,204 B2)

IPR2024-00996 (Patent 8,626,461 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Michael Hawkins

Nicholas Stephens

Joseph Bauer

Thomas Reger

Terry Stalford

Yong Peng

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

hawkins@fr.com

nstephens@fr.com

jbauer@fr.com

reger@fr.com

stalford@fr.com

epeng@fr.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Robert Pluta

William Barrow

Seth Bruneel

William Nash

MAYER BROWN LLP

rpluta@mayerbrown.com

wbarrow@mayerbrown.com

sbruneel@mayerbrown.com

bnash@mayerbrown.com