

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAVANT TECHNOLOGIES LLC d/b/a GE LIGHTING, ELONG
INTERNATIONAL USA INC., and XIAMEN LONGSTAR LIGHTING
CO. LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

FEIT ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00260
Patent 8,604,678 B2

Before KEVIN W. CHERRY, SCOTT B. HOWARD, and
ANDREW L. NALVEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHERRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Extending One-Year Pendency for Good Cause
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11); 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c)

Petitioner filed a Petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1 and 11–14 of U.S. Patent No. 8,604,678 B2. On June 23, 2025, the Board instituted trial. Paper 17. The one-year period normally available to issue a Final Written Decision expires on June 23, 2026.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11), “the final determination in an *inter partes* review [shall] be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a review under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months” The Director has delegated the authority to extend the one-year period to the Chief Administrative Patent Judge. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c). In particular, 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c) provides:

An *inter partes* review proceeding shall be administered such that pendency before the Board after institution is normally no more than one year. The time can be extended by up to six months for good cause by the Chief Administrative Patent Judge

On August 26, 2024, Savant Technologies LLC d/b/a GE Lighting and Ledvance LLC filed a petition requesting *inter partes* review of claims 1–3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 16–21, 25, 26, and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 8,604,678 B2 (“the ’678 patent”). IPR2024-01357, Paper 1. The Board instituted trial in that proceeding on March 5, 2025. IPR2024-01357, Paper 17. On December 9, 2024, Savant Technologies LLC d/b/a GE Lighting, Elong International USA Inc., and Xiamen Longstar Lighting Co. Ltd. (collectively, “Petitioner”) filed a Petition in the instant proceeding, challenging claims 1 and 11–14 of the ’678 patent. Paper 1. On June 12, 2025, the Acting Director issued a decision denying a request by Patent Owner Feit Electric

Company, Inc. for discretionary denial of *inter partes* review and referring the Petition to the Board “to handle the case in the normal course, including by issuing a decision on institution addressing the merits and other nondiscretionary considerations, as appropriate.” Paper 16, 3. The Acting Director’s decision further instructed that, “[a]bsent extraordinary circumstances, the Board shall consolidate this proceeding with IPR2024-01357.” *Id.* The Board instituted trial on June 23, 2025, and ordered this case to be consolidated with IPR2024-01357 pursuant to the Acting Director’s instruction and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(a). Paper 17, 8.

On July 17, 2025, the Chief Administrative Patent Judge authorized extension of the period for issuing a final written decision in IPR2024-01357 by up to six months pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11) and 37 C.F.R. 42.100(c) in view of the limited time otherwise remaining in that proceeding following consolidation with the instant proceeding, and on July 18, 2025, the Board issued an Order extending the proceeding pursuant to the Chief Administrative Patent Judge’s authorization. IPR2024-01357, Papers 31, 33.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(11), the Board is due to issue a Final Written Decision in this proceeding no later than June 23, 2026. On April 30, 2026, we granted in part a motion for additional discovery with respect to IPR2024-01357, in response to which a deposition has been noticed for May 19, 2026, and we have authorized a schedule for additional briefing, based on a joint proposal of the parties, extending to June 18, 2026. *See* Paper 31; Ex. 3003; *see also* IPR2024-01357, Papers 73–75. Based on the unique circumstances set forth above, including the limited time between the completion of briefing related to the authorized additional discovery (see Paper 31) and the present due date, the Chief Administrative Patent Judge

determined that good cause exists to extend the period for issuing a Final Written Decision in this proceeding.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c), the Chief Administrative Patent Judge has determined that good cause exists to extend the one-year period for issuing a Final Written Decision here. Paper 32; 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(c). Accordingly, the time to administer the present proceeding is extended by up to six months.

It is:

ORDERED that good cause exists to extend the time of pendency in this proceeding; and

FURTHER ORDERED that this proceeding is extended by up to six months.

IPR2025-00260
Patent 8,604,678 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

David Radulescu
Andrew Brown
RADULESCU LLP
david@radip.com
andy@radip.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Charles McMahon
Thomas DaMario
BENESCH FRIEDLANDER COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP
cmcMahon@beneschlaw.com
tdamario@beneschlaw.com