

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

PADAGIS US LLC
Petitioner,

v.

NEURELIS, INC.
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2025-00466
Patent 11,793,786

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING

Petitioner hereby requests oral argument pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70 and the Scheduling Order issued in this proceeding. *See* Paper No. 14. Petitioner requests an in-person hearing at the USPTO headquarters in Alexandria, VA on June 16, 2026 as indicated in the scheduling order. Given the substantial overlap in issues in IPR2025-00464, -00465, and -00466, Petitioner requests oral hearing be consolidated into a single hearing for all three of these related proceedings with each party receiving sixty minutes (60) in total to address all three proceedings.

Petitioner expects that the following issues may be raised during oral argument:

- Whether collateral estoppel precludes Patent Owner from contesting findings made by the Board in IPR2019-00451;
- Whether Gwozdz in view of Meezan renders obvious claims 1-25 of the '786 Patent including but not limited to addressing motivation to combine, reasonable expectation of success, and how the prior art teaches all limitations of the claims;
- Whether Gwozdz in view of Meezan and further in view of Cartt renders obvious claims 20-21 of the '786 Patent including but not limited to addressing motivation to combine, reasonable expectation of success, and how the prior art teaches all limitations of the claims;
- Whether Gwozdz in view of Meezan and further in view of USP 23/NF 18 renders obvious claims 26-27 of the '786 Patent including but not

limited to addressing motivation to combine, reasonable expectation of success, and how the prior art teaches all limitations of the claims;

- Whether Gwozdz is prior art under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102 and not excluded as prior art under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. §103;
- Whether Cartt is prior art under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102 and not excluded as prior art under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. §103;
- Whether USP 23/NF 18 is prior art under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102;
- Motions to strike filed by Petitioner and Patent Owner;
- Any motions to exclude that may be filed by either party;
- Any other evidence, issue or motion that was filed and/or briefed by a party during the course of the proceeding; and
- Any other issue that may arise during the course of the oral argument.

Petitioner requests the ability to use audio-visual equipment at the hearing, including a laptop and screen to display demonstratives and exhibits.

Dated: May 5, 2026

Respectfully submitted,
/James P. Murphy/

James P. Murphy
Reg. No. 55,474
Polsinelli PC
1000 Louisiana Street
Suite 6400
Houston, Texas 77002
Tel: (713) 374-1600

Corey Casey
Reg. No. 66,950
Polsinelli PC
900 West 48th Place
Suite 900
Kansas City, Missouri 64112
Tel: (816) 572-4439

Mark Deming
Registration No. 69,263
Polsinelli PC
150 N. Riverside Plaza
Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: (314) 873-3607

Chad Landmon
pro hac vice
1401 Eye Street N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (206) 626-8303

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the Petitioner's Request for Oral Hearing was served on May 5, 2026, via email directed to the following counsel of record for the Patent Owner:

Michael Sitzman
msitzman@mwe.com

Timothy P. Best
tbest@mwe.com

David J. Tobin
dtobin@mwe.com

Raymond Miller
raymond.miller@us.dlapiper.com

N. Nicole Endejann
nicole.endejann@us.dlapiper.com

neurelis-ptab@mwe.com

/Ericka McNeil/

Ericka McNeil
Polsinelli, PC
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 6400
Houston, Texas 77002
Tele: (713) 374-1600