

From: [Trials](#)
To: [Nicholas Stephens](#); [Trials](#)
Cc: [IPR46570-0023IP1](#); [Pluta, Robert G.](#); wbarrow@mayerbrown.com; [Bruneel, Seth](#); [Nash, William B.](#); [Powermat-Anker-Service](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2024-00996 - Petitioner's Request for a Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response
Date: Thursday, December 19, 2024 10:32:10 AM

Counsel,

At this time, the Board does not see a need for further briefing in order to determine whether to institute an *inter partes* review. Accordingly, Petitioner's requests to file a reply to the preliminary response and to file an exhibit are denied.

Best regards,
Eric W. Hawthorne
Supervisory Paralegal Specialist
Patent Trial and Appeal Board

From: Nicholas Stephens <nstephens@fr.com>
Sent: Monday, December 16, 2024 12:22 PM
To: Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: IPR46570-0023IP1 <IPR46570-0023IP1@fr.com>; Pluta, Robert G. <RPluta@mayerbrown.com>; wbarrow@mayerbrown.com; Bruneel, Seth <SBruneel@mayerbrown.com>; Nash, William B. <BNash@mayerbrown.com>; Powermat-Anker-Service <Powermat-Anker-Service@mayerbrown.com>
Subject: IPR2024-00996 - Petitioner's Request for a Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response

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

Your Honors,

Petitioner (Anker Innovations Ltd.) respectfully requests leave to file a 2-page reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (POPR) in the subject proceeding. The reply, if authorized, would address Petitioner's contention that there are differences between Patent Owner's (Powermat Technologies Ltd.) characterizations of the scope of claim element [13.1] ("at least one input power monitor configured to measure input power received by the primary coil from the power supply") in the POPR and in the related E.D. Texas litigation between the parties. Petitioner also requests leave to file an exhibit that includes a pertinent portion (regarding element [13.1]) of the report of Patent Owner's litigation witness, Dr. Tim Williams, which Petitioner intends to cite in support of its arguments in the reply.

IPR2024-00996
Ex. 3001

The parties have conferred and Patent Owner indicates that it opposes Petitioner's request. Patent Owner contends there are no differences in its treatment of element [13.1] between the POPR and the litigation. Should the Board authorize Petitioner's request, Patent Owner has requested authorization to file a sur-reply of the same length as the reply (2-pages). Petitioner does not oppose Patent Owner's request for a sur-reply.

If the Board desires a conference call, the parties will confer and provide their mutual availability.

Respectfully submitted,
Nicholas Stephens

Counsel for Petitioner Anker

Nicholas Stephens
Principal ■ Fish & Richardson P.C.

T: 612 766 2018 | nstephens@fr.com | [Bio](#)

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

