Trials@uspto.gov
571.272.7822

Paper 28
Date: October 8, 2025

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

YEALINK (USA) NETWORK TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD., and
YEALINK NETWORK TECHNOOGY CO., LTD,
Petitioner,

v.

BARCO N.V.
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01436 (Patent 10,762,002 B2)
IPR2024-01437 (Patent 11,403,237 B2)
IPR2024-01438 (Patent 11,258,676 B2)
IPR2024-01439 (Patent 11,422,951 B2)[1]

Before MEREDITH C. PETRAVICK, DAVID C. McKONE and FREDERICK C. LANEY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PETRAVICK*, Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER
Granting Patent Owner's Motions to Seal
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14, 42.54

[1] We issue one Order to be entered in each proceeding. The combined caption is for administrative convenience only and does not indicate a joined case or an expanded panel.

Patent Owner filed Motions to Seal and Motions for Entry of Protective Order in the above-listed proceedings. Papers 22, 23.[2] The Motions for Entry of Protective Order seek entry of a proposed protective order (Ex. 2032) and the Motions to Seal seek sealing of portions of Patent Owner's Responses and Exhibits 2010–2011 and 2023 in each proceeding. Patent Owner has filed public redacted versions of the Patent Owner's Responses and the Exhibits.

Petitioner has not filed any opposition to Petitioner's Motions to Seal, and the period for doing so has expired. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.25(c). Patent Owner has indicated that Petitioner has agreed to accept the terms of the default protective order. Paper 22, 1.

As discussed below, we grant Patent Owner's Motions to Seal and Motions for Entry of Protective Order.

A party may move to seal confidential information including, *inter alia*, sensitive commercial information. 37 C.F.R. § 42.54. It is the movant's burden to show good cause for sealing such information, and we balance the party's asserted need for confidentiality with the strong public interest in open proceedings. *Argentum Pharms. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd.*, IPR2017-01053, Paper 27 at 4 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2018) (informative).

Petitioner provides a sufficient explanation for sealing the Exhibits and the relevant portions of Patent Owner's Response in each of the above-

---

[2] Patent Owner filed substantially the same Motions to Seal, Motions for Entry of Protective Order, and proposed protective order in each proceeding. For efficiency we refer to the paper numbers in IPR2024-01436 unless otherwise indicated.

listed proceedings. Paper 22, 2–7. The Exhibits contain confidential business information, and the portions of Patent Owner's Responses in each of the above-listed proceedings that cite to and quote from the Exhibits similarly contain confidential business information. The information is related to Patent Owner's and a third party's financial information, such as pricing, costs, profits, and licensing terms. *Id.* at 3, 5–7.

After reviewing the record, we are persuaded that good cause exists for sealing the Exhibits and portions of Patent Owner's Response in each of the above-listed proceedings. Our review of the sealed version of Patent Owner's Response in each of the above-listed proceedings persuades us that Petitioner appropriately has limited the redactions in the public version to portions that reflect Petitioner's asserted confidential information. We grant Patent Owner's Motions to Seal and Motion for Entry of Protective Order and enter the parties' agreed upon protective order in each proceeding.

We remind the parties that confidential information that is subject to a protective order ordinarily becomes public forty-five (45) days after final judgment in a trial. *See* the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's Consolidated Trial Practice Guide[3] (84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019)), 21–22. There is an expectation that information will be made public when the existence of the information is identified in a final written decision following a trial. *Id.* After final judgment in a trial, a party may file a motion to expunge

[3] Available at https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated.

confidential information from the record prior to the information becoming public in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.56.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions to Seal (IPR2024-01436, Paper 22; IPR2024-01437, Paper 16; IPR2024-01438, Paper 16; IPR2024-01439, Paper 21) are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that the confidential versions of Exhibits 2010–2011 and 2023 and the Patent Owner's Response shall remain sealed and designated as "Board and Parties Only" until further notice;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Patent Owner's Motion for Entry of Protective Order (IPR2024-01436, Paper 23; IPR2024-01437, Paper 17; IPR2024-01438, Paper 17; IPR2024-01439, Paper 22) is *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the parties' proposed protective order ((IPR2024-01436, Ex. 2032; IPR2024-01437, Ex. 2032; IPR2024-01438, Ex. 2032; IPR2024-01439, Ex. 2032) is entered in each proceeding.

IPR2024-01436 (Patent 10,762,002 B2)
IPR2024-01437 (Patent 11,403,237 B2)
IPR2024-01438 (Patent 11,258,676 B2)
IPR2024-01439 (Patent 11,422,951 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Stephen Yang
Timothy Bickman
Kevin Greenleaf
Forrest Gothia
DENTONS US LLP
Stephen.yang@dentons.com
Timothy.bickman@dentons.com
Kevin.greenleaf@dentons.com
Forrest.gothia@dentons.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Thomas Lee
Amol Kavathekar
HSML P.C.
tlee@hsml.com
akavathekar@hsml.com

Chris Centurelli
Erik J. Halverson
Joshua N. Andrews
K&L GATES LLP
chris.centurelli@klgates.com
erik.halverson@klgates.com
joshua.andrews@klgates.com