

From: [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
To: [Zeilberger, Daniel](#); [Bergeron, Amy](#); [Trials](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
Cc: [DL Entegris-InpriaIPR](#); [PH-Entegris-Inpria-IPR](#)
Subject: RE: Entegris, Inc. v. Inpria Corporation, IPR2025-00267: Request for Leave To File Supplemental Brief
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 12:43:30 PM

Petitioner is authorized to file a supplemental brief addressing the changed circumstances identified in the email below. Petitioner should also address why an *inter partes* review is an appropriate use of Board resources. See *Dabico Airport Sols. Inc. v. AXA Power ApS*, IPR2025-00408, Paper 21 at 2–3 (Director June 18, 2025). Petitioner’s supplemental brief is limited to 5 pages and is due on or before Monday, September 29, 2025. Patent Owner is authorized to file a reply to the supplemental brief. Patent Owner’s reply is limited to 5 pages, and is due no later than Thursday, October 2, 2025.

From: Zeilberger, Daniel <danielzeilberger@paulhastings.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 9:36 AM
To: Bergeron, Amy <amy.bergeron@bakerbotts.com>; Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>; Director_PTABDecision_Review <Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov>
Cc: DL Entegris-InpriaIPR <DLEntegris-InpriaIPR@BakerBotts.com>; PH-Entegris-Inpria-IPR <PH-Entegris-Inpria-IPR@paulhastings.com>
Subject: RE: Entegris, Inc. v. Inpria Corporation, IPR2025-00267: Request for Leave To File Supplemental Brief

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

Your Honors,

Petitioner sent its email below without conferring with Patent Owner in any way whatsoever. In addition, Petitioner’s email includes improper argument. For these reasons alone, Petitioner’s email should be disregarded.

To preserve Patent Owner’s rights, Patent Owner respectfully provides its position regarding Petitioner’s email. In particular, Patent Owner opposes Petitioner’s request. The case Petitioner cites (IPR2025-00207) involved very different circumstances. For example, in that case, “the related litigation upon which the Decision relied ... settled and was dismissed with prejudice less than a week after the [Discretionary] Decision issued.” Here, in contrast, the decision denying institution issued over two months ago. Indeed, in IPR2025-00207, the Petitioner raised its argument in a timely rehearing request, unlike here where Petitioner is seeking a second rehearing request. 37 C.F.R. 42.71(d) (“A party dissatisfied with a decision may file a single request for rehearing without prior authorization from the Board.”). In addition, IPR2025-00207 only involved issues under *Fintiv*, whereas here the Petition presented prior art that was already considered during prosecution. See IPR2025-00267, Patent Owner’s Discretionary Denial Brief, Paper 7 at 25-36.

The issues above are exemplary. Should Petitioner’s request for a second, supplemental rehearing

request be granted, Patent Owner respectfully requests authorization to file a response of equal length in which Patent Owner would provide its complete position.

Respectfully,
Daniel Zeilberger
Counsel for Patent Owner

From: Bergeron, Amy <amy.bergeron@bakerbotts.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 8:43 AM
To: Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>; Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov
Cc: DL Entegris-InpriaIPR <DLEntegris-InpriaIPR@BakerBotts.com>; PH-Entegris-Inpria-IPR <PH-Entegris-Inpria-IPR@paulhastings.com>
Subject: [EXT] Entegris, Inc. v. Inpria Corporation, IPR2025-00267: Request for Leave To File Supplemental Brief

To whom it may concern:

Petitioner Entegris, Inc. respectfully requests authorization under 37 C.F.R. § 42.123 to file a supplemental brief in IPR2025-00267. The parties in the District Court case involving the Challenged Patent, U.S. Patent No. 11,673,903, which was pending in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, *Inpria Corp. v. Lam Research Corp.*, Case No. 1:22-cv-01359, settled and stipulated to dismissal of the case on September 15, 2025. Petitioner, who was not a party to that case, requests authorization to file a supplemental brief to inform the Director about the recent settlement of that matter, and explain that the settlement and resulting cancellation of the trial date mean that the validity of the '903 Patent will no longer be determined in the district court prior to a Final Written Decision issuing in the IPR.

Thus, the basis for the Director's decision of July 2, 2025, for which rehearing has been requested, has now changed, and the Director should grant Petitioner's pending Request for Rehearing of the Director's Decision Discretionarily Denying Institution of Inter Partes Review. See *Arm Ltd. v. Daedalus Prime, LLC*, IPR2025-00207, Paper 14 (PTAB, Aug. 6, 2025) ("Now that the litigation has been dismissed, the balance of factors weighs in favor of referral").

Because the parties to the Delaware action settled only this week, Petitioner could not have reasonably submitted this information earlier. Furthermore, consideration of the supplemental information regarding the settlement would be in the interests-of-justice, as Entegris has been denied an opportunity to challenge the validity of the '903 Patent.

Best,
Amy Bergeron
Senior Associate

Baker Botts L.L.P.
amy.bergeron@bakerbotts.com
T +1.713.229.1610
F +1.713.229.7910
M +1.832.247.3917
910 Louisiana Street
Houston, Texas 77002



Confidentiality Notice:

The information contained in this email and any attachments is intended only for the recipient[s] listed above and may be privileged and confidential. Any dissemination, copying, or use of or reliance upon such information by or to anyone other than the recipient[s] listed above is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately at the email address above and destroy any and all copies of this message.

This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments. If you reply to this message, Paul Hastings may collect personal information including your name, business name and other contact details, and IP address. For more information about Paul Hastings' information collection, privacy and security principles please click [HERE](#). If you have any questions, please contact Privacy@paulhastings.com.