

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS,
AT&T SERVICES, INC., T-MOBILE USA, INC.,
GOOGLE LLC, ERICSSON INC., AND
NOKIA OF AMERICA, CORP.,
Petitioners,

v.

PEGASUS WIRELESS INNOVATION LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2025-00138
U.S. Patent No. 10,181,931

**PATENT OWNER'S AUTHORIZED RESPONSE TO
PETITIONERS' DIRECTOR REVIEW REQUEST¹**

¹ This Response was authorized by the Board via email (Ex. 3101).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Petitioners Never State Their Asserted Basis for Director Review	1
II.	The Director’s Decision was not an Abuse of Discretion	2
III.	New Arguments in a Request for Director Review are Improper	4

Petitioners' Request for Director Review ("Request") fails to present any justification for review and improperly raises new arguments not presented prior to the Request. The Request should be denied.

I. Petitioners Never State Their Asserted Basis for Director Review

"Requests for Director Review ... shall be limited to decisions presenting (a) an abuse of discretion, (b) important issues of law or policy, (c) erroneous findings of material fact, or (d) erroneous conclusions of law." *See* Director Review Process, available at <https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/decisions/director-review-process>, updated May 23, 2025, Section 2.B.

While Petitioners quote this limitation on the Request process, they fail to identify the basis on which they seek review. Instead, they take issue with the Director's *Fintiv* analysis, and assert that the Director erred "because the decision did not consider the additional compelling economic interests at play in this case." Request, 4. Notably, these "additional compelling economic interests" were never raised before in this proceeding, and are not of record. This is improper. Petitioners also assert that the Director allegedly "mishandl[ed]" the *Fintiv* factors, but fail to acknowledge that the Director fully considered each factor and reached a holistic decision. Beyond the improper new issues raised in the Request, Petitioners simply try to relitigate issues already properly considered by the Director, without even attempting to establish that the Director's denial falls into an available category for

further review.

II. The Director’s Decision was not an Abuse of Discretion

The Director’s discretionary decision to deny institution based on *Fintiv* was not arbitrary and requires no review. In criticizing the Director’s *Fintiv* analysis, Petitioners’ Request attempts to relitigate individual *Fintiv* elements. Request, 5-7. But that is not the task before the Director, as a review for “abuse of discretion,” including an “arbitrary and capricious” review, looks to the decision as a whole and not to the individual elements. *See Intelligent Bio-Sys., Inc. v. Illumina Cambridge Ltd.*, 821 F.3d 1359, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“Abuse of discretion exists if ***the decision*** is ... clearly unreasonable, arbitrary, or fanciful”) (emphasis added); *see also Perry v. Raimondo*, 101 F.4th 55, 64-65 (D.C. Cir. 2024) (noting a reviewing court looks to the decision and stating “[t]he fact that some ... factors might weigh in ... favor [of a contrary conclusion] does not render arbitrary or capricious the Board’s conclusion”). Moreover, as the Decision Denying Institution noted, “the determination to exercise discretion to deny institution is based on a holistic assessment of all of the evidence and arguments presented.” DI, 4.

The Director’s *Fintiv* analysis and holistic assessment of all the evidence and arguments presented confirm there was nothing “unreasonable, arbitrary, or fanciful” about its outcome.

While Petitioners assert that the logistics of the pending trial, the complexity of the trial,² and Petitioners' *Sotera* stipulation favor institution (*see* Request, 5-7), this is asking the Director to redo the proper balance of the factors without showing that the Director erred in the first instance. Petitioners fail to establish that the Director's well-considered balance was an abuse of discretion. The Request should be denied.

² Petitioners contradict themselves by simultaneously arguing that the "parallel litigation is large and complex" and thus requires PTAB attention (Request, 6-7), while acknowledging that the trial is being simplified through Patent Owner's dismissal of "patents and claims" from the litigation (Request, 3). The evidence, Ex. 1100, Petitioners injected into the record following the Director's Decision (*see* Ex. 3100) demonstrates that the district court case is rapidly proceeding towards an efficient resolution without PTAB involvement, as the winnowing down of patents and claims shows focus on issues truly in dispute. With the pre-trial conference scheduled for September 4, 2025 (*see* Request, 5 n.3), Petitioners fail to establish any reason that the Board should dedicate administrative resources to this dispute when the district court is already effectively managing the case.

III. New Arguments in a Request for Director Review are Improper

Petitioners improperly include in their Request a new argument that seeks favored treatment based on national status of the entities before the Board, without precedent. Request, 7-10.³ The Request fails to address where this argument, and the alleged parade of horrors that could result from an infringement finding (*see* Request, 7-8), was presented below, for the simple reason that they were not. This new argument should be soundly rejected according to the Director’s guidance. *See* Process, Section 3.E (“The Director will not consider new evidence or new arguments not part of the official record.”).

Should this new argument be considered, it should be rejected as an attempt to gain favored status without basis. The United States patent system is strong because it allows all patent owners—small, large, foreign, domestic—to protect patented innovations, a fact underscored by the thousands of patent applications from foreign countries filed each year. Petitioners will have their day in court many months before a final written decision is expected. What Petitioners will not be able to do in district court, and should not be allowed to do before the Board, is

³ This same argument was originally presented by Petitioners against Patent Owner in Requests for Director Review of institution denials filed in IPR2025-00036 and IPR2025-00037. On August 5, 2025, the Director denied Petitioners’ Requests.

to make inflammatory arguments that certain entities should be entitled to different standards of scrutiny.

Finally, Petitioners also include a new argument about “settled expectations,” (*see* Request, 10-12) but again point to nowhere in the record where this argument was previously presented. And even if this factor were considered, Petitioners fail to establish that a lack of settled expectations outweighs the Director’s proper consideration and weighing of the remaining *Fintiv* factors.

The Request fails to establish any error warranting reconsideration of the Director’s correct denial of institution, and should be rejected.

Dated: August 8, 2025

/Wayne M. Helge/

Wayne M. Helge, Reg. No. 56,905

James T. Wilson, Reg. No. 41,439

BUNSOW DE MORY LLP

277 S. Washington St., Suite 210 #1088

Alexandria, VA 22314

T: (571) 208-0186

Email: whelge@bdiplaw.com

Email : jwilson@bdiplaw.com

Lead Counsel for Pegasus Wireless
Innovation LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Petitioners have consented to e-mail service in this proceeding. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §42.6, the undersigned certifies that on this date, a copy of the foregoing document was served by email upon the following counsel at the below email addresses:

DUANE MORRIS LLP

Jarrad M. Gunther – JMGunther@duanemorris.com
Patrick D. McPherson – PDMcPherson@duanemorris.com
Kevin Anderson – KPAnderson@duanemorris.com

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

Ross R. Barton – ross.barton@alston.com
Christopher TL Douglas – christopher.douglas@alston.com
S. Benjamin Pleune – ben.pleune@alston.com
J. Ravindra Fernando – ravi.fernando@alston.com
David S. Frist – david.frist@alston.com

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Patrick C. Keane – patrick.keane@bipc.com
Roger H. Lee – roger.lee@bipc.com
Andrew J. Koopman – andrew.koopman@bipc.com
Tanya S. Gaylord – tanya.gaylord@bipc.com

Dated: August 8, 2025

/Wayne M. Helge/
Wayne M. Helge (Reg. No. 56,905)
BUNSOW DE MORY LLP
277 S. Washington St., Suite 210, #1088
Alexandria, VA 22314
Email: whelge@bdiplaw.com
Telephone: 571-208-0186

Lead Counsel for Pegasus Wireless
Innovation LLC