

From: [Trials](#)
To: [Shi, Hong](#); [Trials](#)
Cc: [mvandertuig@atllp.com](#); [mvandermolen@atllp.com](#); [rbrophy@atllp.com](#); [David ODell IPR](#); [Greg Michelson IPR](#); [Russ Emerson IPR](#); [Kelly Lyle IPR](#); [Hong Shi IPR](#); [Lao, Jason](#)
Subject: RE: Authorization for Preliminary Replies in IPR2025-00167, -00168, -00169, -00170, -00171
Date: Monday, April 7, 2025 2:23:07 PM

Counsel:

The Board *grants* Petitioner's request for authorization to file a five-page Preliminary Reply addressing the *Fintiv* factors in light of the two intervening events listed below.

Petitioner must file its brief on or before April 18, 2025.

Regards,

Andrew Kellogg,
Deputy Chief Clerk, Trials
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
USPTO
andrew.kellogg@uspto.gov
(571) 272-5366

From: Shi, Hong <Hong.Shi@haynesboone.com>
Sent: Friday, April 4, 2025 2:26 PM
To: Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: [mvandertuig@atllp.com](#); [mvandermolen@atllp.com](#); [rbrophy@atllp.com](#); [David ODell IPR](#) <[david.odell.ipr@haynesboone.com](#)>; [Greg Michelson IPR](#) <[Greg.Michelson.ipr@haynesboone.com](#)>; [Russ Emerson IPR](#) <[russ.emerson.ipr@haynesboone.com](#)>; [Kelly Lyle IPR](#) <[Kelly.Lyle.ipr@haynesboone.com](#)>; [Hong Shi IPR](#) <[Hong.Shi.ipr@haynesboone.com](#)>; [Lao, Jason](#) <[Jason.Lao@haynesboone.com](#)>
Subject: RE: Authorization for Preliminary Replies in IPR2025-00167, -00168, -00169, -00170, -00171

CAUTION: This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

[Message resent due to email address error]

Dear Honorable Board,

Pursuant to 37 CFR 42.108(c), Petitioner Kubota North America Corporation requests leave to file a Preliminary Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response in each of IPR2025-00167, -00168, -00169, -00170, -00171 to address the *Fintiv* issue. Good cause exists for a reply for the following reasons:

1. After the Petition was filed, the parallel district court litigation was stayed. Good cause

therefore exists for a reply so that Petitioner can address the impact of the stay.

2. After the Petition was filed, the Office rescinded the previous Memorandum addressing discretionary denial. Petitioner relied upon the Memorandum in the Petition. Good cause therefore exists for a reply so that Petitioner can address the impact of this development.

Petitioner requests authorization for a five-page reply to the POPR to address the *Fintiv* issue. While Petitioner does not believe a conference call with the Board is necessary, counsel for Petitioner and Patent Owner is generally available next Wednesday, Thursday or Friday if the Board should choose to schedule a conference call.

Petitioner and Patent Owner have conferred, and Patent Owner consents to Petitioner's request.

HAYNES BOONE

Hong Shi

She/Her/Hers

Counsel

hong.shi@haynesboone.com

Haynes and Boone, LLP

98 San Jacinto Boulevard

Suite 1500

Austin, TX 78701

(t) +1 512.867.8440

(f) +1 512.867.8644

[vCard](#) | [Bio](#) | [Website](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission is confidential, may be privileged and should be read or retained only by the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete it from your system.