

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAVANT TECHNOLOGIES LLC d/b/a GE LIGHTING and
LEDVANCE LLC,

Petitioners,

v.

FEIT ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.,

Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01357

Patent 8,604,678 B2

SAVANT TECHNOLOGIES LLC d/b/a GE LIGHTING,
ELONG INTERNATIONAL USA INC., and

XIAMEN LONGSTAR LIGHTING CO. LTD.,

Petitioners,

v.

FEIT ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.,

Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00260

Patent 8,604,678 B2

Before THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, KEVIN W. CHERRY, and
ANDREW L. NALVEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GIANNETTI, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

I. BACKGROUND

On June 23, 2025, the Board entered a decision granting institution of *inter partes* review in IPR2025-00260 (the “’260 IPR”) and consolidated the case for trial with previously-instituted IPR2024-01357 (the “’1357 IPR”). ’260 IPR, Paper 17. The ’260 IPR and the ’1357 IPR involve the same patent (U.S. Patent No. 8,604,678 B2) and overlapping parties. In the ’260 IPR Institution Decision (Paper 17), the Board ordered that “the Scheduling Order entered in IPR2024-01357 shall govern the consolidated proceedings unless modified by the Board.” *Id.* at 9. But because the ’1357 IPR was already underway for over three months, the Board ordered that “counsel for the parties are directed to meet and confer regarding any changes they deem necessary to accommodate the additional claims in the consolidated proceedings” *Id.* On June 30, 2025, in a follow-up email, the Board directed the parties to meet and confer and present a proposed schedule to the Board by Monday, July 7, 2025.

On July 7th, the parties advised the Board that they had reached an impasse on the scheduling issues. The Board responded by scheduling a conference call with the parties for July 11th.

II. DISCUSSION

On July 11, 2025, the Board panel held a conference with counsel for the parties to discuss scheduling of the consolidated proceedings and related

issues.¹ The discussion centered around a revised schedule proposed by the Patent Owner. The parties agreed that Patent Owner should have the opportunity to respond to the petition in the '260 IPR and, if desired, to cross-examine Petitioner's expert, Dr. Doolittle, on his declaration in the '260 IPR (Exhibit 1022). At the same time, the parties agreed to work together to avoid duplication of work already done in the '1357 IPR on overlapping issues. For example, Patent Owner agreed to limit its examination of Dr. Doolittle to issues raised in the '260 IPR (namely, patentability of claims 11–14) but not in the '1357 IPR. Also, Patent Owner agreed to advise the Board whether they intend to file a motion to amend the claims challenged in the '260 IPR.² The Board pointed out the the pending contingent motion to amend in the '1357 IPR proposes amending claim 1, from which claims 11–14 depend.

At the end of the conference, the Board agreed to take the scheduling and other issues under advisement.

There was also a brief discussion of the parties' extensive objections to evidence and possible motions to exclude evidence. The Board provided additional guidance on filing such motions.

III. ORDER

It is, therefore,

¹ Along with counsel for the parties, Judges Giannetti, Cherry, and Nalven participated in the conference.

² Patent Owner has since advised the Board that "Patent Owner intends to exercise its right to file a motion to amend in connection with IPR2025-00260."

IPR2024-01357 (Patent 8,604,678 B2)

IPR2025-00260 (Patent 8,604,678 B2)

ORDERED that the due dates set forth in the '1357 IPR Scheduling Order (Paper 19) are modified by the attached Revised Due Date Appendix, and the General Instructions and other information regarding Due Dates and Motions to Amend in that Scheduling Order are incorporated by reference in this Order.

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner shall make Dr. Doolittle available for cross-examination by Patent Owner on his declaration in the '260 IPR (Ex. 1022) at a mutually convenient time before the due date for Patent Owner's response to the petition in that proceeding. Cross-examination of Dr. Doolittle is strictly limited to the subject matter of this declaration and will avoid repeating subjects covered in his previous deposition in IPR2024-01357;

FURTHER ORDERED that in conducting this *inter parties* review counsel make every effort to avoid duplication of work already done in IPR2024-01357; and

FURTHER ORDERED that within five business days before filing a motion to exclude evidence under 37 C.F.R. § 42.64(c), the filing party must contact the Board to request a conference to discuss the motion.

REVISED DUE DATE APPENDIX³

DUE DATE 1	May 28, 2025
Patent Owner's response to the petition in IPR2025-01357	
Patent Owner's motion to amend in IPR2025-01357	
DUE DATE 1A	July 25, 2025
Patent Owner's response to the petition in IPR2025-00260	
Patent Owner's motion to amend claims 11–14	
DUE DATE 2	October 3, 2025
Petitioner's reply to Patent Owner's response to the petitions (both cases)	
Petitioner's opposition to motions to amend (both cases)	
Board's preliminary guidance on motions to amend (both cases).....October 31, 2025	
DUE DATE 3	November 13, 2025
Patent Owner's sur-reply to reply (both cases)	
Patent Owner's reply to opposition to motion to amend (or Patent Owner's revised motion to amend) (both cases) ⁴	

³ Wherever a Due Date is indicated as applicable to both cases, filings by a party will be combined into one submission addressing both cases and will be subject to the standard word count and page limits for a single proceeding. For further instructions on these Due Dates, *see* Section B of the '1357 IPR Scheduling Order (Paper 19).

⁴ *See* Sections A.6 and B.3 of the '1357 IPR Scheduling Order (Paper 19) for more information on filing revised motions to amend.

IPR2024-01357 (Patent 8,604,678 B2)

IPR2025-00260 (Patent 8,604,678 B2)

DUE DATE 4 November 22, 2025
Request for oral argument (both cases) (may not be extended by stipulation)

DUE DATE 5 January 6, 2026
Motion to exclude evidence (both cases)

DUE DATE 6 January 13, 2026
Opposition to motion to exclude (both cases)
Request for prehearing conference (both cases)

DUE DATE 7 January 29, 2026
Reply to opposition to motion to exclude (both cases)

DUE DATE 8 February 12, 2026
Oral argument (if requested) (both cases)

IPR2024-01357 (Patent 8,604,678 B2)

IPR2025-00260 (Patent 8,604,678 B2)

PETITIONER:

David C. Radulescu

Andrew S. Brown

RADULESCU LLP

david@radip.com

andy@radip.com

PATENT OWNER:

Michael Pomeroy

Alexis L. Ritzer

Scott Breedlove

CARTER ARNETT BENETT & PEREZ PLLC

mpomeroy@carterarnett.com

aritzer@carterarnett.com

sbreedlove@carterarnett.com

Charles M. McMahon

Thomas DaMario

BENESCH FRIEDLANDER COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP

cmcmahon@beneschlaw.com

tdamario@beneschlaw.com