

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

**SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,**

Petitioners,

v.

VASU HOLDINGS, LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2025-00449

U.S. Patent No. 10,368,281

**PETITIONERS' RANKING AND EXPLANATION OF PARALLEL
PETITIONS**

1. Petitioners herewith file two petitions for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 10,368,281 (“’281 patent”), IPR2025-00448 (“Petition 1”) and IPR2025-00449 (“Petition 2”), and submit this explanation of the differences between the petitions and a ranking of the petitions for the Board’s consideration. As these petitions do not present cumulative challenges in a manner contemplated by the Board, Petitioners request that these two petitions be independently considered.

2. Petitioners challenge 6 total claims of the ’281 patent across the two petitions, all of which are independent claims, and total 985 words. These claims recite different configurations of elements, calling for applications of the prior art in different ways and under different grounds, based on three different primary references. Patent Owner has asserted all of these claims against Petitioners in district court litigation. Due to the length of the challenged claims and the differences between these claims, these grounds could not be presented in a single filing. Each challenged claim is challenged in only one petition. Petition 1 (IPR2025-00448) has 4 grounds, challenges claims 1, 12, 31, and 37 and is 13,990 words. Petition 2 (IPR2025-00449) has 4 grounds, challenges claims 23 and 45 and is 13,981 words. In addition, there are distinctions between the claims addressed in the two petitions. In Petition 1, challenged claims 1, 31, and 37 focus on how a mobile devices switches communications from a wireless local area network to a cellular network, and challenged claim 12 involves switching from a

cellular network to a wireless local area network. All grounds in Petition 1 are based on a single primary reference. On the other hand, in Petition 2, challenged claim 45 is focused on how a network “server interface” controls switching between networks, while claim 23 has the additional requirement that a mobile device twice activates a second communication module. Because of these differences in claim scope, Petition 2 involves two primary references that are not used in the Petition 1 grounds. Accordingly, multiple petitions are needed.

3. Comparison and rankings of the petitions:

'281 Patent	Petition 1 IPR2025-00448	Petition 2 IPR2025-00449
Challenged Claims	1, 12, 31 and 37	23 and 45
Used Word Count	13,990 words	13,981 words
Number of Grounds	4	4
Ranking	#1	#2

4. The ranking above is provided to comply with the Trial Practice Guide only. As these two petitions are necessitated by word count constraints, and all claims asserted against Petitioner in litigation cannot otherwise be challenged, the ranking in no way communicates a choice of one petition to the exclusion of the other.

5. As these petitions present arguments in a manner contemplated by the Board and are not cumulative challenges, the Board should exercise its discretion to institute both petitions because of the material differences discussed above and the strong showing of obviousness in both petitions.

Dated: January 24, 2025

/James L. Davis, Jr./
James L. Davis, Jr.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e) and 42.105(b) on the Patent Owner by FedEx of a copy of this Petitioners' Ranking and Explanation of Parallel Petitions at the correspondence address of record for the '281 patent:

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS, A LAW CORPORATION
162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

Dated: January 24, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /James L. Davis, Jr./
Name: James L. Davis, Jr.
Registration No. 57,325
ROPES & GRAY LLP

Lead Counsel for Petitioners