Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 50
Date: February 18, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

YEALINK (USA) NETWORK TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD, and YEALINK NETWORK TECHNOLOGY, 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 Motion to Submit Supplemental Information
37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b)

---

[1] We issue one Order to be entered in each proceeding. The combined caption is for administrative convenience only.

More than one month after institution of *inter partes* review, Patent Owner requested authorization to file a motion to submit supplemental information. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b). After oral argument, we authorized Patent Owner to file, in each proceeding, motions to submit supplemental information.

Patent Owner has now filed the Motions (Paper 52[2] ("Motion" or "Mot.")) seeking to enter as exhibits documents titled[3] Declaration of Dunxiong Cai (Ex. 2035) and Defendants' Opposed Motion for Ongoing Royalty (Ex. 2036) from a related district court proceeding.

Petitioner filed an Opposition to the Motion. Paper 56 ("Opposition" or "Opp.").

Our rules provide that a party seeking to submit supplemental information more than one month after the date the trial is instituted, "must show why the supplemental information reasonably could not have been obtained earlier, and that consideration of the supplemental information would be in the interests-of-justice." 37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b).

Patent Owner argues that the Declaration of Dunxiong Cai and Defendants' Opposed Motion for Ongoing Royalty could not have been submitted earlier because these documents were first filed in the related district court proceeding on January 13, 2026, and, until the documents were

---

[2] Unless otherwise indicated, we cite to paper and exhibit numbers from IPR2024-01436. The parties filed substantially similar papers and exhibits in each proceeding.

[3] The Motion refers to these documents as the Sworn Declaration of Dunxiong Cai (Ex. 2035) and Yealink's Opposed Motion for Compulsory License (Ex. 2036). We, however, will refer to the documents by their titles.

filed, Patent Owner was not aware and had no evidence to show that Petitioner "decided to reintroduce the WWPP30 to the U.S. market in 2026." Mot. 2–3 (quoting Ex. 2036).

Petitioner responds that Patent Owner knew, for well over a year, of Petitioner's intent to reintroduce the WPP30 product upon resolution of the related district court litigation because the parties have negotiated terms for resuming sales since at least June 2023 and that, on December 19, 2025, counsel for the parties conferred as to Defendants' Opposed Motion for Ongoing Royalty. Opp. 1 (citing Ex. 20235 ¶¶ 6–9, 11, 13). Petitioner argues that "[n]othing in Petitioner's Texas filing contains new or unforeseen information." Opp. 1.

We are persuaded by Patent Owner that the documents could not have reasonably been submitted earlier because the documents were first filed in the related district court on January 13, 2026. Though negotiations may have be ongoing since June of 2023, we are persuaded that Patent Owner had no evidence to submit in this proceeding until the documents were filed in the related district court proceeding.

Patent Owner next argues that consideration of the documents would be in the interests-of-justice because the documents contain information that is inconsistent with statements made in Petitioner's papers of record. Mot. 3–5. In particular, Patent Owner contends that "Yealink's decision to reintroduce its WPP dongles in the U.S. and to seek a license to the patent challenged in this proceeding is inconsistent" with Petitioner's representation, in its Reply, that Petitioner had stopped selling the dongles in the U.S. *Id.* at 3 (referencing Paper 29, 18). Patent Owner also contends

that "Yealink's request for a compulsory license to the very patent Yealink contends is obvious . . . directly contradicts Yealink's position with regard to not only the Crestron license, but also its argument that Barco's patented technology is of little value." *Id.* at 4.

According to Petitioner, Patent Owner mischaracterizes Defendants' Opposed Motion for Ongoing Royalty as seeking a compulsory license and admitting nonobviousness, and Petitioner contends that "[n]othing in Petitioner's motion contradicts its representations to the Board." Opp. 2. Petitioner asserts that "its plans to reintroduce the WPP30 have no relevance to whether Patent Owner's patents are obvious" and that it sought a court-ordered ongoing royalty to avoid unnecessary future litigation. *Id.* at 3.

We are persuaded by Patent Owner that consideration of the documents would be in the interests-of-justice. In response to Patent Owner's arguments pertaining to secondary considerations (Paper 53, 64–66) the Petitioner's Reply states: "Indeed, Yealink stopped selling dongles in the U.S., but still has a business selling base units, demonstrating that base units have material value even without a dongle" (Paper 29, 20). Patent Owner persuades us that the documents contain evidence that appears to be inconsistent with this statement. Under the circumstances in these proceedings, consideration of the documents is in the interests-of-justice.

We grant Patent Owner's Motions to Submit Supplemental Information and enter the Declaration of Dunxiong Cai and Defendants' Opposed Motion for Ongoing Royalty into the records.

We also grant Patent Owner's request for authorization to each file a five-page paper to address the Declaration of Dunxiong Cai and Defendants' Opposed Motion for Ongoing Royalty. Mot. 5.

ORDER

It is:

ORDERED that, in each proceeding, Petitioner's Motion to Submit Supplemental Information is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that the Declaration of Dunxiong Cai and Defendants' Opposed Motion for Ongoing Royalty are entered into the record of each proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that, within five business days of this order, in each proceeding, Patent Owner may file a five-page paper, limited to addressing the relevance of the Declaration of Dunxiong Cai and Defendants' Opposed Motion for Ongoing Royalty to the parties' arguments already of record, pertaining to commercial success;

FURTHER ORDERED that, within five business days of the filing of Patent Owner's papers, Petitioner may file five-page responses to Patent Owner's papers.

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 Bickham
Kevin Greenleaf
Forrest Gothia
DENTONS US LLP
ipt.docketchi@dentons.com
stephen.yang@dentons.com
kevin.greenleaf@dentons.com
timothy.bickham@dentons.com
forrest.gothia@dentons.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Christopher Centurelli
Erik Halverson
Joshua Andrews
K&L GATES LLP
christopher.centurelli@klgates.com
erik.halverson@klgates.com
joshua.andrews@klgates.com