

From: [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
To: [Michael Matulewicz-Crowley](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#); [Trials](#)
Cc: [LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent](#); [RJ XtreamEdge-AMD](#); [Chris Ponder](#); [Jeffrey Liang](#); [Harper Batts](#); [Scott Cole](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2025-00223 - Request for Authorization for Opposition to Petitioners' Request for Rehearing (Paper 10)
Date: Thursday, July 17, 2025 9:17:56 AM

Patent Owner is authorized to file a 5-page opposition to Petitioners' request for rehearing in IPR2025-00223, due no later than Thursday, July 24, 2025.

From: Michael Matulewicz-Crowley <mmatulewicz-crowley@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2025 5:15 PM
To: Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>; Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppardmullin.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Chris Ponder <CPonder@sheppardmullin.com>; Jeffrey Liang <JLiang@sheppardmullin.com>; Harper Batts <HBatts@sheppardmullin.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2025-00223 - Request for Authorization for Opposition to Petitioners' Request for Rehearing (Paper 10)

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

Dear Director and Honorable Board,

Patent Owners requested authorization to file a 5-page opposition to Petitioners' request for rehearing (Paper 10) in the above-captioned proceeding. In an abundance of caution, Patent Owners are forwarding that request to the Director's Discretionary Denial email address, to assure the request is directed to the proper recipient. Petitioners do not oppose Patent Owner's request. Patent Owners' full request is copied below.

There is good cause for Patent Owners' requested opposition, including to address the facts and arguments discussed in Petitioners' filing. Patent Owners are typically allowed the opportunity to address such new developments. *See Solaredge Technologies, Ltd. v. SMA Solar Technology AG*, IPR2020-00021, Paper 28 at 3 (P.T.A.B June 15, 2022) ("As a general matter, a party opposing a request for rehearing may not file an opposition absent a request from the Board. Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide 58 (November 2019), 3 90. Accordingly, *SMA Solar Technology AG ('Patent Owner')* **has not yet had a chance to respond to the Request. Given the change in controlling guidance from the Director, the Panel authorizes Patent Owner to file an opposition to the Request.**" (emphasis added)); *ARM, Ltd. v. Daedalus Prime LLC*, IPR2025-00207, Exhibit 3100 (P.T.A.B June 13, 2025) (*sua sponte* authorizing Patent Owner "to submit a response limited to the issues raised in the Director Review request"). Here, Patent Owners' requested opposition is necessary to provide the Director with a complete view of the relevant facts and law.

If requested, the parties are both available to have a telephone conference.

Best,
Michael
Michael Matulewicz-Crowley
REICHMAN JORGENSEN LEHMAN & FELDBERG LLP
400 Madison Avenue, Suite 14D
New York, NY 10017
(332) 208-7170

From: Michael Matulewicz-Crowley
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 4:59 PM
To: Trials@uspto.gov
Cc: LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent <LegalTM-AMD-Concurrent@sheppardmullin.com>; RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD <RJ_XtreamEdge-AMD@reichmanjorgensen.com>; Chris Ponder <CPonder@sheppardmullin.com>; Jeffrey Liang <JLiang@sheppardmullin.com>; Harper Batts <HBatts@sheppardmullin.com>; Scott Cole <scole@reichmanjorgensen.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2025-00223 - Request for Authorization for Opposition to Petitioners' Request for Rehearing (Paper 10)

Dear Honorable Board,

Patent Owners respectfully request authorization to file a 5-page opposition to Petitioners' request for rehearing (Paper 10) in the above-captioned proceeding. Petitioners do not oppose Patent Owner's request.

There is good cause for Patent Owners' requested opposition, including to address the facts and arguments discussed in Petitioners' filing. Patent Owners are typically allowed the opportunity to address such new developments. *See Solaredge Technologies, Ltd. v. SMA Solar Technology AG*, IPR2020-00021, Paper 28 at 3 (P.T.A.B June 15, 2022) ("As a general matter, a party opposing a request for rehearing may not file an opposition absent a request from the Board. Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide 58 (November 2019), 3 90. Accordingly, ***SMA Solar Technology AG ('Patent Owner') has not yet had a chance to respond to the Request. Given the change in controlling guidance from the Director, the Panel authorizes Patent Owner to file an opposition to the Request.***" (emphasis added)); *ARM, Ltd. v. Daedalus Prime LLC*, IPR2025-00207, Exhibit 3100 (P.T.A.B June 13, 2025) (*sua sponte* authorizing Patent Owner "to submit a response limited to the issues raised in the Director Review request"). Here, Patent Owners' requested opposition is necessary to provide the Director with a complete view of the relevant facts and law.

If requested, the parties are both available to have a telephone conference with the Board.

Best,
Michael
Michael Matulewicz-Crowley
REICHMAN JORGENSEN LEHMAN & FELDBERG LLP
400 Madison Avenue, Suite 14D
New York, NY 10017

(332) 208-7170

NOTICE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately via reply e-mail, and then destroy all instances of this communication. Thank you.