

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

YEALINK (USA) NETWORK TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD., AND YEALINK
NETWORK TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.,

Petitioners,

v.

BARCO N.V.

Patent Owner.

CASE: IPR2025-00491

U.S. PATENT NO. 10,684,972

**PATENT OWNER'S MOTION TO SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL
INFORMATION**

Exhibit List

Exhibit	Description
Ex. 2001	U.S. Publication No. 2015/0121466 (“Brands”)
Ex. 2002	U.S. Publication No. 2014/0362161 (“Leete”)
Ex. 2003	PTAB Memo
Ex. 2004	Email Authorizing Supplemental Paper of June 3, 2025
Ex. 2005	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Michael Brogioli
Ex. 2006	September 22, 2025 Deposition Transcript of Kevin C. Almeroth
Ex. 2007	Reserved
Ex. 2008	Reserved
Ex. 2009	Reserved
Ex. 2010	Barco Sales Data (<i>Confidential and Redacted Versions Filed</i>)
Ex. 2011	Crestron License Agreement (<i>Confidential and Redacted Versions Filed</i>)
Ex. 2012	<i>Barco and Crestron announce patent license agreement regarding a set of essential ClickShare patents</i> , BARCO (Sept. 12, 2023) https://web.archive.org/web/20240810204702/https://www.barco.com/en/about/press-releases/barco-and-crestron-announce-patent-license-agreement-regarding-a
Ex. 2013	<i>ClickShare conferencing & collaboration</i> , BARCO (April 1, 2025), https://web.archive.org/web/20250401012647/https://www.barco.com/en/products/clickshare-conferencing-collaboration#expand
Ex. 2014	<i>ClickShare Button</i> , BARCO (February 12, 2025) https://web.archive.org/web/20250212164931/https://www.barco.com/en/product/clickshare-conferencing-button
Ex. 2015	Reserved

Exhibit	Description
Ex. 2016	Reserved
Ex. 2017	List of Products Covered by Barco Patents accessible at: https://www.barco.com/en/about/terms-conditions/patents
Ex. 2018	<i>Patent</i> , CRESTRON (June 12, 2025) https://www.crestron.com/legal/patents?page=1
Ex. 2019	Crestron Electronics Private Company Profile, PITCHBOOK
Ex. 2020	Reserved
Ex. 2021	Reserved
Ex. 2022	Reserved
Ex. 2023	Excerpts from April 18, 2025 Deposition Transcript of Andrew Ludke (<i>Confidential and Redacted Versions Filed</i>)
Ex. 2024	Reserved
Ex. 2025	<i>ClickShare CX-30</i> , BARCO (October 8, 2025) https://web.archive.org/web/20250826005128/https://www.barco.com/en/product/clickshare-cx-30
Ex. 2026	David Martens and Willem Van Iseghem, <i>Security Whitepaper ClickShare Conference</i> , BARCO (March 23, 2020)
Ex. 2027	Gary Kayye, <i>Here's a Detailed Look at the New Barco ClickShare Conference From the Launch Event in NYC</i> , RAVE (January 27, 2020) https://web.archive.org/web/20251017182523/https://www.ravepubs.com/heres-a-detailed-look-at-the-new-barco-clickshare-conference-from-the-launch-event-in-nyc/
Ex. 2028	Gary Kayye, <i>Here's a Detailed Look at the New Barco ClickShare Conference From the Launch Event in NYC</i> , RAVE (January 27, 2020) https://web.archive.org/web/20201021153400/https://www.ravepubs.com/heres-a-detailed-look-at-the-new-barco-clickshare-conference-

Exhibit	Description
	from-the-launch-event-in-nyc/
Ex. 2029	Rebekah Carter, <i>ClickShare Delivers Wireless Conferencing</i> , UC TODAY (March 19, 2020) https://web.archive.org/web/20251017184342/https://www.uctoday.com/collaboration/clickshare-delivers-wireless-conferencing/
Ex. 2030	Declaration of Dr. Michael Brogioli
Ex. 2031	Reserved
Ex. 2032	Modified Protective Order
Ex. 2033	February 27, 2026 Deposition Transcript of Kevin C. Almeroth
Ex. 2034	Patent Owner Demonstrative (<i>Confidential and Redacted Versions Filed</i>)
PROP. Ex. 2035	Declaration of D. Cai dated Jan. 12, 2026, filed in <i>Barco, Inc. et al v. Yealink (USA) Network Technology Co., Ltd. et al</i> , 2:23-cv-00521 (E.D. Tex.) on January 20, 2026, in support of Yealink’s Motion for Compulsory License
PROP. Ex. 2036	Yealink’s Motion for Compulsory License filed in <i>Barco, Inc. et al v. Yealink (USA) Network Technology Co., Ltd. et al</i> , 2:23-cv-00521 (E.D. Tex.) on January 20, 2026

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.123(b), Patent Owner Barco NV hereby moves to submit Proposed Exhibit 2035, the sworn declaration “under penalty of perjury” of Dunxiong Cai and Proposed Exhibit 2036, Yealink’s Opposed Motion for Compulsory License, that Yealink filed accompanying Mr. Cai’s Declaration. The Board authorized Barco via email to submit this Motion on Friday, May 1, 2026.

Barco’s Motion should be granted because Yealink previously represented to the Board that “Petitioner stopped selling its dongles in the U.S., but continues to have a successful business selling base units, demonstrating that base units have material value even without a dongle,” (Paper 33, 22–23) in an attempt to minimize the importance and value of Barco’s patented inventions. Proposed Exhibits 2035 and 2036 are evidence that Yealink’s statements regarding the value of Barco’s patent inventions are false and contradicted by Yealink simultaneously seeking a compulsory license to reenter this market. *See* Proposed Exhibit 2035 at 3 (“Yealink *has decided* to reintroduce its WPP30 in the United States, and *will resume selling* its WPP30 dongle in 2026”) (emphasis added); Proposed Exhibit 2036 at 1 (“Yealink has decided to reintroduce the WPP30 to the U.S. market in 2026.”).

II. ARGUMENT

A. Barco’s Request is Timely

Barco submitted its request for authorization to file this motion on February 20, 2026, one month after these two proposed exhibits were filed under seal with the court in Texas and one month after Petitioner made its inconsistent representation to the Board in this proceeding (Paper 33).¹ Before Yealink filed Proposed Exhibits 2035 and 2036 in the Texas court, there was no evidence for Barco to submit to the Board, and Barco was *not aware* Yealink had “decided to reintroduce the WPP30 to the U.S. market in 2026[,]” so this request could not have been made earlier. The concurrent inconsistent representations by Yealink underscore the minimal weight the panel should afford any argument by Petitioner that its dongle is not required to compete in the relevant market. The month between the availability of public versions of Yealink’s motion for a compulsory license (Proposed Exhibits 2035 and 2036) and Barco’s request for authorization to file this motion have minimal impact to the timeliness of Barco’s request because (1) authorization for this motion was still sought approximately two months before oral argument on this issue and (2) the supplemental information is specifically related to Yealink’s representation that it has stopped selling its product in the United States.

¹ Barco submits the publicly filed version of the Proposed Exhibits from January 20, 2026. Sealed versions were filed in District Court on January 13, 2026.

Both Barco and Yealink have an obligation to submit this information, which “is inconsistent with a position advanced by [Yealink] during the proceeding[.]” *See* 37 C.F.R. 42.51(b)(1)(iii); 37 CFR § 42.11. Notably, Petitioner’s Reply advanced the argument that “Petitioner stopped selling its dongles in the U.S.” on January 20, 2026, one week *after* it filed a declaration, under the penalty of perjury, that “Yealink has decided to reintroduce its WPP30 in the United States, and will resume selling its WPP30 dongle in 2026. Paper 33, 26 (Dated January 20, 2026); Proposed Exhibit Ex. 2035, 3 (Executed on January 12, 2026). This underscores the lengths Petitioner will go to advance its positions, presenting patently inconsistent representations to different tribunals.

As the Trial Practice Guide states, although the oral hearing has now passed, given this proceeding is not close to the one-year deadline and given the request to submit this supplemental information was made before the hearing, Patent Owner submits its request is timely. *See* Trial Practice Guide at 48.

B. Barco’s Request is in the Interests-of-Justice

Yealink represented to the Board that it had “stopped selling its dongles in the U.S.” to minimize the importance and value of both the dongle products and Barco’s patented technology, *after* telling the court in Texas that the opposite. *See* Paper 33, 22–23. Yealink’s decision to reintroduce its WPP dongles in the U.S. and to seek a compulsory license to the patents in that proceeding is inconsistent with its

representation to this panel that it had stopped selling its WPP products and a ground to grant motions for supplemental information. *Instrumentation Lab. Co. v. Hemosonics LLC*, No. IPR2017-00852, Paper 36 at 7 (P.T.A.B. July 11, 2018) (granting motion based on inconsistencies between the arguments). Yealink has argued that Barco's patents, including the one challenged in this proceeding, have no value. Yealink does this by arguing that Yealink did not need its WPP dongle products in the market. Yealink also argued that Barco's evidence of secondary considerations are deficient and not probative under *Ancora Techs., Inc. v. Roku, Inc.*, No. 2023-1674, 2025 WL 1679967, at *7 (Fed. Cir. June 16, 2025). Yealink's unequivocal statement that it *will* reintroduce its WPP dongle product directly contradicts Yealink's position with regard to not only the Crestron license, but also its argument that Barco's patented technology is of little value. Proposed Exhibit 2036 at 1.

Proposed Exhibit 2036 is a request that the trial court order a compulsory license, over Barco's objections. That Yealink seeks a compulsory license and proposes paying \$54 per unit royalty to reintroduce its WPP dongles directly contradicts its position that the dongles provide little value. *See generally* Proposed Exhibit 2036. Yealink's compulsory license request bolsters the secondary consideration of non-obvious, establishing that Yealink needs to sell its WPP dongle embodiment to compete in this market with Barco and Crestron, and is consistent

with the Crestron license as it relates to licensing the challenged patent and acquiescence of its validity by a leading market competitor. Ex. 2011. Moreover, Yealink alleged the Crestron license is inapplicable because it covered more than the patents in this proceeding. However, Yealink's request itself proposes a compulsory license to multiple different patents. Proposed Exhibit 2036 at 5 ("the hypothetical license in this case include only six U.S. patents across two families").

To ensure Yealink cannot make further inconsistent arguments and inconsistent positions regarding its need to obtain a compulsory license to sell its WPP products, Proposed Exhibits 2035 and 2036 should be included in the record. Patent Owner also requests both parties be permitted to submit a brief 5-page paper to explain the applicability of the evidence to the obviousness arguments that Petitioner advances in this proceeding. *Instrumentation Lab. Co. v. Hemosonics LLC*, No. IPR2017-00852, Paper 36 at 7 (P.T.A.B. July 11, 2018) (granting motion based on inconsistencies between the arguments made in different proceedings).

III. CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Patent Owner requests that Proposed Exhibits 2035 and 2036 be added to this proceeding and a short 5-page paper be provided to each party to address the two Proposed Exhibits. Patent Owner can provide such a paper within one week of an order on these two exhibits.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 8, 2026

By: /Erik Halverson/
Erik Halverson
Reg. No. 73,552
K&L GATES LLP
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94111
erik.halverson@klgates.com
T: (415) 882-8238
F: (415) 882-8220

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 8, 2026, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be served on the following counsel of record for Petitioners by electronic mail to the following addresses:

Stephen Yang
stephen.yang@dentons.com
Kevin R. Greenleaf
kevin.greenleaf@dentons.com
Forrest Gothia
forrest.gothia@dentons.com
Dentons US LLP
233 South Wacker Drive,
Suite 5800
Chicago, IL 60606
Tel: (212) 398-4890
Fax: (212) 768-6800
Email: ipt.docketchi@dentons.com

By: /Erik Halverson/
Erik J. Halverson
Reg. No. 73,552