

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BOE TECHNOLOGY GROUP CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

OPTRONIC SCIENCES LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01131
Patent 7,226,801 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

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, a final written decision resolving this proceeding would be due no later than February 12, 2026. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) (final written decision presumptively due no later than one year after entry of decision on institution); Paper 15 (Decision on Institution, dated February 12, 2025).

On January 16, 2026, the parties notified the Board by email that they had reached an agreement in principle to settle certain district court litigation between them and that they were finalizing a settlement agreement that would potentially encompass the instant proceeding. Ex. 3002. Subsequently, the parties confirmed in an email message dated January 25, 2026, that the settlement would encompass this proceeding and requested that the Board stay the deadlines in the proceeding while the settlement agreement was finalized. *Id.* The panel held a conference call with the parties on February 5, 2026, in which the parties requested a thirty-day extension of the deadline imposed by 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) while they continue to finalize their settlement agreement.

Under the circumstances presented, the Chief Administrative Patent Judge determines that extending the deadline for the final written decision will promote efficient resolution of this proceeding 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.

IPR2024-01131

Patent 7,226,801 B2

Handwritten signature of Kalyan K. Deshpande in blue ink.

Digitally signed by
Users, Deshpande,
Kalyan
Date: 2026.02.06
08:27:26 -05'00'

Kalyan K. Deshpande
Chief Administrative Patent Judge

IPR2024-01131
Patent 7,226,801 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Alan A. Limbach
Brian Erickson
Michael Saulnier
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
alan.limbach@us.dlapiper.com
brian.erickson@us.dlapiper.com
michael.saulnier@us.dlapiper.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Qi (Peter) Tong
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT
ptong@raklaw.com