Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 18
Entered: February 27, 2025

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

WIZ, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ORCA SECURITY LTD.,
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2024-00863 (Patent 11,663,031 B2)
IPR2024-00864 (Patent 11,663,032 B2)
IPR2024-00865 (Patent 11,693,685 B2)
IPR2024-01109 (Patent 11,726,809 B2)
IPR2024-01190 (Patent 11,740,926 B2)
IPR2024-01191 (Patent 11,775,326 B2)[1]

---

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, GARTH D. BAER, and SCOTT RAEVSKY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BAER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
Authorizing Patent Owner's Motion for Additional Discovery
*37 C.F.R. § 42.5(a)*

---

[1] This Order is to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading in any subsequent papers.

On February 25, 2025, Orca Security Ltd. ("Patent Owner") submitted an email request for authorization to file a Motion for Additional Discovery in the above-identified proceedings. Patent Owner's email request stated that it

> seeks discovery of certain documents that Petitioner Wiz, Inc. ("Wiz") produced in district court litigation, wherein Orca contends the requested documents demonstrate objective indicia of nonobviousness of the challenged claims, including skepticism of Orca's claimed inventions, industry praise for Orca's inventions, and Wiz's copying of Orca's inventions claimed in each of the challenged patents.

Ex. 3001, 1.

On February 26, 2025, we conducted a conference call with the parties to discuss Patent Owner's request.

We authorize Patent Owner to file a Motion for Additional Discovery, limited to 10 pages, due no later than Wednesday, March 5th, 2025. We further authorize Petitioner to file an Opposition, limited to 10 pages, due no later than Wednesday, March 12th, 2025. We take this opportunity to remind the parties that the Motion and Opposition must explain why the additional discovery is, or is not, "necessary in the interest of justice" (35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(5)) by addressing the factors set forth by the Board in *Garmin Int'l, Inc. v. Cuozzo Speed Techs. LLC*, Case IPR2012-00001, Paper 26 at 6–7 (PTAB Mar. 5, 2013) (precedential).

The parties are reminded that any requests to enforce or modify the District Court Protective Order should be directed to the District Court and not the Board.

IPR2024-00863 (Patent 11,663,031 B2)
IPR2024-00864 (Patent 11,663,032 B2)
IPR2024-00865 (Patent 11,693,685 B2)
IPR2024-01109 (Patent 11,726,809 B2)
IPR2024-01190 (Patent 11,740,926 B2)
IPR2024-01191 (Patent 11,775,326 B2)

For PETITIONER

Matthew A. Argenti
Michael T. Rosato
Wesley E. Derryberry
Joseph M. Baillargeon
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
margenti@wsgr.com
mrosato@wsgr.com
wderryberry@wsgr.com
jbaillargeon@wsgr.com

For PATENT OWNER

Christopher Henry
Kristina McKenna
Steven W. Peters
Raghav Bajaj
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
christopher.henry@lw.com
krissy.mckenaa@lw.com
steven.peters@lw.com
raghav.bajaj@lw.com