

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RESMED CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

CLEVELAND MEDICAL DEVICES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2025-00160
U.S. Patent No. 11,786,680

PATENT OWNER'S AUTHORIZED MOTION TO TERMINATE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
III. ARGUMENT.....	3
A. ResMed Inc. is an Unnamed RPI	4
1. ResMed Inc. and Petitioner Share Officers and Offices.....	4
2. ResMed Inc. Controls Petitioner’s Legal Proceedings	5
IV. CONCLUSION.....	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aylo Freesites Ltd. v. Dish Techs. L.L.C.</i> , No. IPR2024-00940, Paper 71 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2026)	5, 7
<i>Aylo Freesites Ltd. v. Dish Techs. L.L.C.</i> , No. IPR2024-00940, Paper 75 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 3, 2026).....	1, 4
<i>Cleveland Medical Devices Inc., v. ResMed Inc.</i> , No. 22-cv-00794, Dkt. No. 1 (D. Del. June 16, 2022)	2
<i>Cleveland Medical Devices Inc., v. ResMed Inc.</i> , No. 22-cv-00794, Dkt. No. 163 (D. Del. Oct. 2, 2023).....	2
<i>Radware, Inc. v. F5 Networks, Inc.</i> , No. IPR2017-01185, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2017)	4, 5
<i>ResMed Corp. v. Fractus, S.A.</i> , No. IPR2026-00191, Paper 1 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 2, 2026)	7
<i>Sirius XM Radio, Inc. v. Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Angewandten Forschung E.V.</i> , No. IPR2018-00681, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2018).....	4, 7
Statutes	
35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2).....	1, 2, 3, 4
35 U.S.C. § 315(b)	1, 4, 7
Other Authorities	
37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1)	1

PATENT OWNER'S EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description
2001	Duan, Zhenhai, et al., “Push vs. Pull: Implications of Protocol Design on Controlling Unwanted Traffic” (USENIX July 7, 2005)
2002	Bunny webpage, “What is the Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP)?” available at https://bunny.net/academy/http/what-is-http-hypertext-transfer-protocol/# , dated March 12, 2025
2003	Appsierra webpage, “Software Architecture: N Tier, 3 Tier, 1 Tier, 2 Tier Architecture,” available at https://www.appsierra.com/blog/tiers-in-software-architecture#:~:text=One , dated April 1, 2024
2004	Excerpts of Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant ResMed Corp.'s Initial Invalidity and Unenforceability Contentions cover pleading, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 23-cv-02221-BMB (N.D. Ohio), served on July 15, 2024
2005	Excerpts of Defendant ResMed Inc.'s Initial Invalidity Contentions cover pleading from <i>Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc. v. ResMed, Inc.</i> , No. 22-cv-00794-JLH (D. Del.) (the “Delaware Case”), served on February 21, 2023
2006	Excerpts of Plaintiff ResMed Corp.'s Response and Affirmative Defenses to Defendant's Counterclaims for Patent Infringement, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 23-cv-02221-BMB, Dkt. No. 66 (N.D. Ohio), filed on March 18, 2024
2007	Excerpts of Declaration of James Hannah in Support of Defendant CleveMed's Opposition to Plaintiff ResMed's Motion for Temporary Stay Pending Mediation, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 23-cv-02221-BMB, Dkt. No. 87-1 (N.D. Ohio), filed on August 21, 2024
2008	Excerpts of Declaration of Lisa Kobialka in Support of Defendant CleveMed's Opposition to Plaintiff ResMed's Motion to Stay, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 23-cv-02221-BMB, Dkt. No. 100-1 (N.D. Ohio), filed on January 24, 2025

Patent Owner's Authorized Motion to Terminate
IPR2025-00160 (U.S. Patent No. 11,786,680)

Exhibit	Description
2009	Excerpts of ResMed Corp.'s Reply in Support of its Motion to Stay, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 23-cv-02221-BMB, Dkt. No. 101 (N.D. Ohio), filed on January 31, 2025
2010	Excerpts of Defendant Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc.'s Memorandum in Support of its Motion to Dismiss or Transfer, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 23-cv-00500-TWR-JLB, Dkt. No. 10-1 (S.D. Cal.), filed on June 5, 2023
2011	<i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 1:23-cv-02221-BMB, Dkt. No. 87-5, Declaration of Hani Kayyali in Support of Patent Owner's Opposition to Motion to Stay Pending Mediation (N.D. Ohio), filed on August 21, 2024
2012	<i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 1:23-cv-02221-BMB, Dkt. No. 87-6, excerpts of Petitioner's parent company's (ResMed) Q4 FY2024 Earnings call (N.D. Ohio), filed on August 21, 2024
2013	"Reexamination Operational Statistics," last updated June 2024, available at https://www.uspto.gov/learning-and-resources/statistics/reexamination-information , last visited on January 24, 2024
2014	Excerpts from American Inventors Protection Act of 1999, H.R. Rep. No. 106-287, Part 1 (Aug. 1999)
2015	Declaration of Dr. Michael T. Goodrich in Support of Patent Owner's Response
2016	Declaration of Dr. David A. Borkholder in Support of Patent Owner's Response
2017	Excerpts from Introduction to Computer Security, by M. Goodrich & R. Tamassia, Pearson (2011)
2018	Deposition Transcript of Sandeep Chatterjee, Ph.D., <i>ResMed Corp v. Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2025-00159 and IPR2025-00160, taken on September 8, 2025

Patent Owner's Authorized Motion to Terminate
IPR2025-00160 (U.S. Patent No. 11,786,680)

Exhibit	Description
2019	Deposition Transcript of Jason P. Kirkness, Ph.D., <i>ResMed Corp v. Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2025-00159 and IPR2025-00160, taken on August 28, 2025
2020	S. Zhang & M. Wang, "Server Classifications," Encyclopedia of Information Systems, Vol. 4 (2003)
2021	Online Learning Platform, "What is single-tier, Two-tier and Three-tier Architecture of Software?" dated July 17, 2025, available at https://statlearner.org/what-is-single-tier-two-tier-and-three-tier-architecture-of-software
2022	O. Korede, "Back to Basics: Tiers in Software Architecture," dated June 27, 2023, available at https://dev.to/skylinecodes/back-to-basics-tiers-in-software-architecture-4eg6
2023	Brooke, "Client vs Server Code in Anvil," dated September 3, 2025, available at https://anvil.works/articles/client-vs-server
2024	AlgoMaster webpage, "Client-Server Architecture," by Ashish Singh, dated September 8, 2025, available at https://algomaster.io/learn/system-design/client-server-architecture
2025	G. Mwamba, et al., "Architectural Review of Client-Server Models," International Journal of Scientific Research & Engineering Trends, Vol. 10, Issue 1 Jan-Feb-2024
2026	C. Probst, et al., "Where can an Insider Attack?" FAST 2006, LNCS 4691, pp. 127-142 (2007)
2027	L. Wolf, "Preventing Failure: The Value of Performing a Single Point of Failure Analysis for Critical Applications and Systems," Information Systems Security, Taylor & Francis Group, Vol. 13 (2004), available at https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1201/1086/44119.13.1.20040301/80434.7

Exhibit	Description
2028	P. Williams & A. Woodward, “Cybersecurity vulnerabilities in medical devices: a complex environment and multifaceted problem,” Dove Medical Press Limited, dated July 20, 2015, available at https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4516335/
2029	H. Borrie, “Factors Impacting Scalability” from “Firebird Databases as the Back-end to Enterprise Software Systems,” November 28, 2006, available at https://www.firebirdsql.org/file/documentation/papers_presentations/html/paper-fbent-impacting.html
2030	LibreTexts Engineering, “11.3: Two-tier and Three-tier Architectural Distinctions,” printed July 15, 2025, available at https://eng.libretexts.org/Courses/Delta_College/Introduction_to_Database_Systems/11%3A_Client_Server_Architecture/11.03%3A_Two-tier_and_Three-tier_Architectural_Distinctions
2031	GeeksforGeeks webpage, “Difference Between Two-Tier and Three-Tier Database Architecture,” dated July 15, 2025, available at https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/dbms/difference-between-two-tier-and-three-tier-database-architecture/
2032	Intentionally omitted
2033	“Information Consumer Technologies 2010,” Perceptions of Libraries, 2010: Context and Community
2034	Explain that Stuff webpage, “How do cellphones work?” by Chris Woodford, dated February 20, 2025, available at https://www.explainthatstuff.com/cellphones.html
2035	L. Saad, “Gallup Vault: Misjudging Cellphone Adoption,” dated February 16, 2018, available at https://news.gallup.com/vault/227810/gallup-vault-misjudging-cellphone-adoption.aspx

Patent Owner's Authorized Motion to Terminate
IPR2025-00160 (U.S. Patent No. 11,786,680)

Exhibit	Description
2036	C. Beckwith, "RESMED VPAP III Ventilator," Ventilator Handouts, Biomedical Engineering Department Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Trust, dated October 4, 2005 (Revision 1)
2037	"Mobile Medical Applications – Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff," U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration, dated September 25, 2013
2038	Deposition Transcript of Sandeep Chatterjee, Ph.D., <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc.</i> , Nos. IPR2025-00159 and IPR2025-00160, taken on January 27, 2026
2039	Intentionally omitted
2040	Excerpts of Plaintiff ResMed Corp.'s Response and Affirmative Defenses to Defendant's Second Amended Counterclaims for Patent Infringement, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 1:23-cv-02221-BMB, Dkt. No. 75 (N.D. Ohio), filed on April 25, 2024
2041	Notice of Party with Financial Interest, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 1:23-cv-02221-BMB, Dkt. No. 6 (S.D. Cal.), filed on April 19, 2023
2042	ResMed Corp., Business Filing Details – Office of Minnesota Secretary of State, dated February 11, 2026, available at https://mblsportal.sos.mn.gov/Business/SearchDetails?filingGuid=f207cb20-a3d4-e011-a886-001ec94ffe7f
2043	Michael Fliss – ResMed Executive Team Bios, dated February 11, 2026, available at https://www.resmed.com/en-us/about-us/executive-team/
2044	ResMed Executive Team Bios, ResMed Webpage, dated February 11, 2026, available at https://www.resmed.com/en-us/about-us/executive-team

Patent Owner's Authorized Motion to Terminate
IPR2025-00160 (U.S. Patent No. 11,786,680)

Exhibit	Description
2045	U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Form 10-K for ResMed Inc. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025
2046	Defendant ResMed Inc.'s First Supplemental Disclosure Statement, <i>Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc. v. ResMed, Inc.</i> , No. 22-cv-00794-GBW (D. Del.), served on June 15, 2023
2047	Plaintiff ResMed Corp.'s Initial Disclosures, <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Med. Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 1:23-cv-02221-BMB (N.D. Ohio), served on January 2, 2024
2048	Deposition Transcript of Jason P. Kirkness, Ph.D., <i>ResMed Corp. v. Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc.</i> , Case No. IPR2025-00247, taken on February 4, 2026

I. INTRODUCTION

This proceeding should be terminated because the Petitions do not identify all real parties in interest (“RPIs”) as required by 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1). The record confirms that ResMed Inc.—Petitioner’s parent, financial consolidator, and the entity that coordinates litigation strategy, funds work, and directly benefits from these challenges—is an omitted RPI. Despite acknowledging that ResMed Inc. is an RPI in a bevy of other cases between the parties, it abruptly changed course and omitted ResMed Inc. here without explanation. Aside from Petitioner’s earlier concessions, ResMed Inc. is an RPI in view of blurred corporate structures, and because ResMed Inc. is a clear beneficiary with ***at least*** an opportunity to control its wholly owned subsidiary, ResMed Corp.

The Office has made clear that it will enforce § 312(a)(2). As the *Corning Optical* memorandum states, “[t]he integrity of PTAB proceedings depends on knowing who is behind a petition—who funds it, directs it, and/or benefits from it” (Ex. 3004 at 4), and the Office will now enforce the requirement to identify all RPIs. And under *Aylo*, a petitioner’s correction to add an omitted RPI “requires according the Petition a new filing date.” *Aylo Freesites Ltd. v. Dish Techs. L.L.C.*, No. IPR2024-00940, Paper 75 at 3 (P.T.A.B. Feb. 3, 2026). When the proper RPI disclosure here necessarily results in a new filing date, the Petitions become time-barred under 35 U.S.C. § 315(b) and the proceedings must be terminated.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

CleveMed and ResMed Inc. have been engaged in litigation since 2022, when CleveMed's initiated the Delaware Action, asserting U.S. Patent No. 10,076,269 among others. *Cleveland Medical Devices Inc., v. ResMed Inc.*, No. 22-cv-00794, Dkt. No. 1 (D. Del. June 16, 2022). In that case, the court rejected ResMed Inc.'s contention that it was not the proper defendant in view of earlier concessions that it was "the appropriate party for certain of the same products accused in this action." *Id.*, Dkt. No. 163 at 13-14 (D. Del. Oct. 2, 2023).

While the Delaware litigation was pending, ResMed Corp. petitioned for IPR of the '269 patent, naming itself and ResMed Inc. as RPIs. IPR2023-00565, Paper 1 at 5 n.1 ("ResMed Inc., a separate entity, is identified as a RPI out of an abundance of caution and to avoid debate over the scope of RPI in 35 U.S.C. §312(a)(2)."). In the same Petition, however, ResMed Corp. hid behind ResMed, Inc., when arguing that it would be inappropriate to reject the petition under *Fintiv*. *Id.* at 5 ("Also, importantly, Petitioner is **not** party to parallel litigation – the suit identified above (Sec. I.B.) was filed against a separate entity, ResMed Inc. – so the *Fintiv* factors should all weigh against discretionary denial.").

ResMed Corp. later filed for declaratory-judgment of non-infringement regarding U.S. Patent No. 11,602,284 ("'284 Patent"), and Patent Owner countered with claims of infringement against ResMed Corp. and ResMed Inc., asserting

infringement of the '284 Patent and the patents currently involved in proceedings before the Board.¹ In that case, ResMed Corp. aligned itself with ResMed Inc. by incorporating ResMed Inc.'s invalidity contentions and answer and affirmative defenses from the Delaware case. *See* Ex. 2040 (No. 23-cv-02221, Dkt. No. 75 at ¶¶ 205, 224, 259 (N.D. Ohio Apr. 25, 2024)). ResMed Corp. also identified ResMed Inc. as having a direct financial interest in the litigation's outcome. Ex. 2041 (No. 23-cv-02221, Dkt. No. 6 at 2 (N.D. Ohio Apr. 19, 2023)).

This pattern of naming both entities continued in the post-grant context. In December 2023, ResMed filed a PGR petition challenging the '284 patent and again named ResMed Corp. and ResMed Inc. as RPIs. PGR2024-00012, Paper 2 at 4 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 13, 2023). Only later, in a follow-on IPR challenging the '284 Patent, and in the Petitions now pending before the Board, did ResMed abruptly omit ResMed Inc. as an RPI. *See* IPR2025-00157, Paper 1 at 71 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 15, 2024); *see also e.g.*, IPR2025-00247, Paper 1 at 72 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 10, 2025). Petitioner offered no explanation for its shift, which irreconcilable with the record.

III. ARGUMENT

35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(2), mandates that a Petition cannot be considered unless it identifies all RPIs, including those who control or have the opportunity to control

¹ Patent Nos. 11,690,512; 11,375,921; 11,786,680; 11,857,333; and 11,872,029.

this proceeding. The PTAB's *Corning Optical* memorandum confirms that the Office will enforce § 312(a)(2)'s RPI requirement and emphasizes that the integrity of PTAB proceedings depends on knowing who is behind a petition, including who funds, directs, and/or benefits from it. *Corning Optical* Memo at 4. Further, under *Corning Optical*, "any Petition corrected to disclose additional RPIs must be given a new filing date." *Aylo*, No. IPR2024-00940, Paper 75 at 3. Here, the record shows ResMed Inc. exercised control, direction, and has a direct financial stake in these challenges, yet Petitioner identified only ResMed Corp. Because correcting the Petition's required disclosures results in a new filing date, it is barred under § 315(b) and thus, the Board must terminate the proceeding.

A. ResMed Inc. is an Unnamed RPI

ResMed Inc. is an RPI in these proceedings. There is no question that there is significant relationship between the parties because ResMed Corp. is a fully-owned subsidiary of ResMed, Inc. *Sirius XM Radio, Inc. v. Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Angewandten Forschung E.V.*, No. IPR2018-00681, Paper 12 at 4-6 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 6, 2018); *Radware, Inc. v. F5 Networks, Inc.*, No. IPR2017-01185, Paper 9 at 8-20 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 11, 2017).

1. ResMed Inc. and Petitioner Share Officers and Offices

Like in *Sirius* and *Radware*, ResMed Inc. and Petitioner share executive officers and a physical business address. *Id.* Minnesota business records for

Petitioner show that its Chief Executive Officer is Michael Fliss and the Principal Executive Office address 9001 Spectrum Center Blvd., San Diego, California 92123. Ex. 2042. Michael Fliss is also the Chief Revenue Officer for ResMed Inc. and is listed on ResMed's Leadership team webpage. Ex. 2043; Ex. 2044. The 2025 Form 10-K for ResMed Inc. shows its address as being 9001 Spectrum Center Blvd., San Diego, California 92123 and lists ResMed Corp. as a "significant subsidiary." Ex. 2045 at 1, 251. The significant overlap in corporate leadership between Petitioner and ResMed Inc. and the sharing of physical offices is "indicative of corporate blurring" necessitating the inclusion of ResMed Inc. as an RPI. *Radware*, No. IPR2017-01185, Paper 9 at 13; *Aylo Freesites Ltd. v. Dish Techs. L.L.C.*, No. IPR2024-00940, Paper 71 at 7 (P.T.A.B. Jan. 9, 2026) (finding "common controlling directors" and co-reliance on business services warrant identification as RPI).

2. ResMed Inc. Controls Petitioner's Legal Proceedings

ResMed Inc. has control or the opportunity to control the pending IPRs as evidenced by ResMed Inc.'s inclusion as a RPI on prior IPRs and PGRs against related patents, including those involved in the same district court litigation as the current patents in IPR. *See* IPR2023-00565, Paper 42 at 3; PGR2024-00012, Paper 1 at 4; *see also Aylo*, No. IPR2024-00940, Paper 71 at 7 (finding prior identification of RPI in IPRs pertaining to similar technology evidence that the party should be identified in the present case). Indeed, while Patent Owner was litigating the '269

Patent against ResMed Inc., ResMed Corp. inserted itself into the IPR proceeding against the '269 Patent and filed for declaratory judgment against the '284 Patent, starting the Ohio matter. In both litigations, ResMed Inc. and Petitioner share the same litigation counsel, and there is overlap between the witnesses appearing on the initial disclosures in both. Ex. 2046 at 2-3 (identifying Gregory Dench and Michael Pinczuk); Ex. 2047 at 3 (identifying Gregory Dench and Michael Pinczuk).

Further showing that ResMed Inc. is a controlling authority is the 10-K filing with the SEC for ResMed Inc. that describes the various litigations involving ResMed Inc. and Petitioner, including these proceedings, as a collective stating that “**we** are subject to routine litigation incidental to **our** business” and that “[b]ased on currently available information, **we** are unable to make a reasonable estimate of loss or range of losses.” Ex. 2045 at 101-102 (emphasis added).

Dr. Kirkness' numerous engagements with ResMed Inc., including work on product development and patent investigations, and his inability to testify as to whether Petitioner or ResMed Inc. is paying for his service in the current IPRs confirm ResMed Inc. routinely exercises such control over Petitioner's matters. Ex. 2048 (Kirkness Tr. (IPR2025-00247)) at 13:19-14:2 (unable to identify the entity that is paying his fees); *id.* at 8:5-13:18 (discussing contracts received from ResMed Inc.); *see also* Ex. 1004 at 1, 7-8 (showing multiple contracts with ResMed Inc.); *id.* at 15, 18 (describing multiple engagements with ResMed Inc.).

Dr. Kirkness has also represented ResMed Inc. before the PTAB, and current PTAB docket searches show no other PTAB proceedings where Petitioner omitted ResMed Inc. as an RPI. *See, e.g.*, IPR2022-00993, Exs. 1046-1047 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 8, 2023). In fact, in its most recent Petition against Fractus, S.A. that was filed by the same counsel representing Petitioner in the pending IPRs, it named ResMed Inc. as an RPI without any reservations. *ResMed Corp. v. Fractus, S.A.*, No. IPR2026-00191, Paper 1 at xiv (P.T.A.B. Jan. 2, 2026). Thus, there is no excuse for not naming ResMed Inc. as an RPI here.

Based on ResMed Inc.'s "full ownership of Petitioner, its identical management composition, and evidence of its past [and current] control in legal matters involving Petitioner," ResMed Inc. is required to be identified as an RPI in the Petitions. *Sirius XM Radio*, No. IPR2018-00681, Paper 12 at 6; *Aylo*, No. IPR2024-00940, Paper 71 at 7. Since correction of the Petitions would accord it a new filing date that would be beyond the one-year deadline under § 315(b), the Petitions should be dismissed.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Patent Owner respectfully requests the Petitions in IPR2025-00158, IPR2025-00159, IPR2025-00160, IPR2025-00246, and IPR2025-00247 be dismissed and the proceedings terminated.

Patent Owner's Authorized Motion to Terminate
IPR2025-00160 (U.S. Patent No. 11,786,680)

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 23, 2026

/Jeffrey H. Price/

Jeffrey H. Price (Reg. No. 69,141)

HERBERT SMITH FREEHILLS

KRAMER (US) LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036

Telephone: (212) 715-9100

Facsimile: (212) 715-8000

jeffrey.price@hsfkramer.com

(Case No. IPR2025-00160)

Attorneys for Patent Owner

Cleveland Medical Devices, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), and pursuant to agreement by the parties that filing with the Board through the P-TACTS constitutes electronic service if Patent Owner provides the foregoing document (excluding exhibits), service was made on the Petitioner as detailed below.

<i>Date of service</i>	February 23, 2026
<i>Manner of service</i>	Electronic Filing and Electronic Mail (PH-ResMed-CleveMed@paulhastings.com)
<i>Documents served</i>	PATENT OWNER'S AUTHORIZED MOTION TO TERMINATE
<i>Persons Served</i>	Paul Hastings LLP Lisa K. Nguyen David M. Tennant Grace Wang Eric E. Lancaster Howard Herr Kamilah Alexander Rachel Wu Hankinson

/Jeffrey H. Price/
Jeffrey H. Price
Registration No. 69,141
Counsel for Patent Owner