

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

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

v.

MOBILE DATA TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner

IPR2025-00537
U.S. Patent No. 8,825,801

**PETITIONERS' SUR-REPLY REGARDING
DISCRETIONARY DENIAL**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Intel Corp. v. Proxense LLC</i> , IPR2025-00327, -328, -329	2
<i>Tesla, Inc. v. Intell. Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2025-00217, -219-222, -339	1

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Reference
1001	U.S. Patent 8,825,801 to Harper (“the ’801 patent”)
1002	Declaration of Henry Houh, Ph.D. in Support of Petition for <i>Inter Partes</i> Review of U.S. Patent 8,825,801
1003	Excerpts from Alan Neibauer, <i>How to Do Everything With Yahoo!</i> (2000) (“Neibauer”)
1004	PCT Application WO 00/17775 to Craig Miller et al. (filed September 22, 1999, published March 30, 2000) (“Miller”)
1005	U.S. Patent No. 7,574,486 B1 to Yin Cheng et al. (filed November 8, 2000, issued August 11, 2009) (“Cheng”)
1006	U.S. Patent No. 6,434,403 B1 to Michiel R. Ausems et al. (filed February 19, 1999, issued August 13, 2002) (“Ausems”)
1007-1009	<i>RESERVED</i>
1010	U.S. Patent No. 6,487,583 B1 to Jamey Harvey et al. (filed February 25, 2000, issued November 26, 2002) (“Harvey”)
1011	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0015759 A1 to Robert Francis Squibbs (filed February 21, 2002, published August 23, 2001) (“Squibbs”)
1012	Excerpts from Uwe Hansmann et al., <i>Pervasive Computing Handbook</i> (2001) (“Hansmann”)
1013	Excerpts from David Fox & Troy Downing, <i>HTML Web Publisher’s Construction Kit</i> (1995) (“Fox”)
1014-1021	<i>RESERVED</i>
1022	File history of U.S. Patent No. 8,825,801 B2
1023	<i>RESERVED</i>

Exhibit	Reference
1024	Excerpts of file history of <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent No. 8,135,801 B2
1025	Joint Claim Construction Statement, Dkt. 51, <i>Mobile Data Technologies LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , Case No. 7:22-cv-00244- ADA-DTG (W.D. Tex. filed September 13, 2023)
1026	Declaration of Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, Ph.D. (“Hall-Ellis”) from IPR2024-00247
1027	U.S. Patent 6,167,137 to Ogdon et al. (“Ogdon”)
1028	U.S. Patent 8,135,801 to Harper et al.
1029	Order Granting <i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination of U.S. Patent 8,135,801
1030	<i>Meta Platforms, Inc. v Mobile Data Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2024-00247, Paper 26 (PTAB Oct. 2, 2024).
1031	Declaration of June Munford
1032	Excerpt from Webster’s Dictionary of Computer Terms (page 98)
1033	<i>Meta Platforms, Inc. v Mobile Data Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2024-00247, Paper 33 (PTAB Jan. 10, 2025).
1034	US Patent No. 6,955,298 to Herle (“Herle”)
1035	U.S. Patent App. Publ. No. 2002/0102998 to Lin (“Lin”)
1036	RESERVED
1037	H.R. Rep. No. 112-98 (2011)
1038	Delaware Department of State, Division of Corporations, Entity Page for Mobile Data Technologies LLC, https://icis.corp.delaware.gov/ecorp/entitysearch/NameSearch.aspx

Exhibit	Reference
1039	First Am. Compl., <i>Mobile Data Techs. LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00435-JRG-RSP, Dkt. No. 25 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 6, 2024)
1040	Patent Assignment Record for US 8,825,801 to Mobile Data Technologies LLC
1041	Patent Assignment Record for US 8,825,801 conveying Security Interest to Chisum
1042	Order Re Def.'s Mot. to Compel Litig. Funding Docs., <i>Entangled Media, LLC v. Dropbox Inc.</i> , No. 23-cv-03264-PCP (VKD), Dkt. No. 254 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 8, 2025)
1043	Order, <i>Electrolysis Prevention Sols. LLC v. Daimler Truck North Am. LLC</i> , No. 3:21-cv-00171-TEJ-WCM, Dkt. No. 147 (W.D.N.C. July 24, 2023)
1044	Complaint, <i>Mobile Data Technologies LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , Case No.7:22-cv-00244-ADA-DTG, Dkt. No. 1 (W.D. Tex. Nov. 23, 2022)
1045	<i>America Invents Act: Hearing on H.R. 1249 Before the Subcomm. on Intell. Prop., Competition, & the Internet of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary</i> , 112th Cong. (March 30, 2011)
1046	157 Cong. Rec. 13,159 (2011)
1047	Complaint, <i>Mobile Data Techs. LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00435-JRG-RSP, Dkt. No. 1 (E.D. Tex. June 10, 2024)
1048	Unopposed Mot. for Extension of Time to Move, Answer or Otherwise Respond to Pl.'s Compl. & Waiver of Foreign Service Requirement, <i>Mobile Data Techs. LLC v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.</i> , No. 2:24-cv-00435-JRG-RSP, Dkt. No. 5 (E.D. Tex. June 26, 2024)

Exhibit	Reference
1049	Docket Navigator, Gilstrap Uncontested Motions to Stay Pending IPR, 2014-present, pulled May 26, 2025
1050	Pl.'s Unopposed Mot. to Stay Proceedings Pending IPR, <i>Mobile Data Technologies LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , Case No.3:24-cv-00896-WHA, Dkt. No. 111 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 18, 2024)
1051	Pacer, List of Calendar Events Set for Judge Gilstrap for 4/1/2026-4/30/2026, pulled June 4, 2025
1052	United States District Court – Judicial Caseload Profile 2020-March 2025
1053	Jennifer Nall, DLA Piper, <i>How Delayed Notice of Date Accorded Mailings May Affect Inter Partes Review</i> (June 3, 2025), https://www.dlapiper.com/en/insights/publications/intellectual-property-news/2025/how-delayed-notice-of-date-accorded-mailings-may-affect-inter-partes-review
1054	Andrew T. Dufresne et al., Perkins Coie, <i>How Reliable are Trial Dates Relied on by the PTAB in the Fintiv Analysis?</i> , 1600 PTAB & Beyond (Oct. 29, 2021)
1055	Katherine K. Vidal, Under Sec’y of Com. for Intell. Prop. & Dir. of the USPTO, Mem. Re Interim Proc. for Discretionary Denials in AIA Post-Grant Procs. with Parallel Dist. Ct. Litig. (June 21, 2022), <i>rescinded</i> Feb. 28, 2025
1056	Samsung Newsroom, Samsung Members App Puts Galaxy Experts at Your Fingertips (Apr. 8, 2016), https://news.samsung.com/global/samsung-members-app-puts-galaxy-experts-at-your-fingertips
1057	Email from N. Birbach to Counsel for PO re IPR Nos. IPR2025-00535 – IP2025-00544 – Updated Sotera Stipulation

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
PO	Patent Owner Mobile Data Technologies LLC
Op.	Petitioners' Response to Patent Owner's Discretionary Denial Brief, Paper 11
Meta-MDT-IPR	<i>Meta Platforms, Inc. v. Mobile Data Technologies LLC</i> , IPR2024-00247
POR	Patent Owner's Reply in Support of Discretionary Denial, Paper 13

There are no settled expectations counseling in favor of discretionary denial.

First, PO's patents and their ancestors have already been subject to instituted post-grant challenge on no fewer than ten occasions. Nine out of those ten challenges ended in unfavorable outcomes for PO. For example, in three proceedings, two ancestors to the '801 patent were found unpatentable, one based partly on the same art presented here, with all three decisions summarily affirmed on appeal. (Op., 16.) The Board then instituted the Meta-MDT-IPR against the '801 patent based on the same art presented here. (Op., 11.) Finally, the Board instituted Meta's IPRs against five related patents, *including the '336 patent*, based in part on Neibauer and Cheng. IPR2024-00246, -248-251.

There is no reasoned basis for PO to conclude that the '801 patent's validity is, or ever has been, "settled." *See Tesla v. Intell. Ventures II*, IPR2025-00217, Paper 9, 2 (Stewart June 13, 2025). For example, the '5801 patent was found invalid and, like the challenged patent, covered methods and/or systems for sharing content amongst multiple users. (EX-1024, 3-4.) Thus, PO's expectations are inherently unsettled. PO's assertion that the '336 reexam was "based on Neibauer" is false. (POR, 2.) The reexam relied on four unrelated references, and the requestor made two passing citations to Neibauer to support motivation to combine. (EX-2050, 65.) Regardless, the Examiner erred by not considering Neibauer on the merits, and one instance of an ancestor surviving reexam cannot

evidence settled expectations in view of nine other instances where the Board found at least a reasonable likelihood that the claims were invalid.

Second, PO argues that Petitioners should have been aware of the '801 patent since May 2015 because related patent was cited during prosecution of Petitioners' design patent. (POR, 1 (incorrectly relying on *Ericsson* where the challenged patent was cited, not an ancestor).) But by May 2015, the subject patent *had already been found unpatentable* in reexam. (EX-1024, 1.) At that time, the only reasonable conclusion was that the patent posed no risk. Moreover, imposing a duty to investigate here would hold Petitioners to an impossible standard. Likely at least hundreds of thousands of patents and applications are cited on the face of Petitioners' over 145,000 issued patents. Requiring Petitioners to assess and challenge every cited patent and their family members would exact an undue burden on innovators like Samsung.

Third, even accepting PO's incorrect assertion that it inherited the expectations of its predecessor and that those expectations were "settled" (Op. 15-20), any such expectations do not outweigh Petitioners' settled expectations of non-infringement as articulated in *Intel*. IPR2025-00327, Paper 12, 2-3 (Stewart June 26, 2025). PO fails to address Petitioners' eight years of undisturbed commercialization of the accused technology before PO finally sued Petitioners. Thus, settled expectations weigh against discretionary denial.

Date: July 23, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Naomi L. Birbach/

Naomi L. Birbach (Reg No. 67,113)
Goodwin Procter LLP
620 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10018
Phone: (212) 813-8800
nbirbach@goodwinlaw.com

Counsel for Petitioners

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a true copy of Petitioners' Sur-Reply
Regarding Discretionary Denial has been served on the Patent Owner via e-mail to
the following counsel of record:

Erick S. Robinson (Reg. No. 51,354)
Patrick M. Dunn (Reg. No. 70,474)
Jayme Partridge (Reg. No. 39,011)
Jayne C. Piana (Reg. No. 48,424)
BROWN RUDNICK LLP
811 Main Street, Suite 1825
Houston, TX 77002
erobinson@brownrudnick.com
pdunn@brownrudnick.com
jpartridge@brownrudnick.com
jpiana@brownrudnick.com
MDT-Samsung-BR@brownrudnick.com
Tel: (281) 815-0511
Fax: (281) 605-5699

Eugene Goryunov (Reg. No. 61,579)
Homayoon Rafatijo (Reg. No. 80,870)
BROWN RUDNICK LLP
601 Thirteenth Street NW Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
egoryunov@brownrudnick.com
hrafatijo@brownrudnick.com
Tel: (202) 536-1700
Fax: (202) 536-1701

Ian G. DiBernardo (Reg. No. 40,991)
BROWN RUDNICK LLP
Times Square Tower, 47th Fl.
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036
idibernardo@brownrudnick.com
Tel: (212) 209-4800

Fax: (212) 209-4801

Attorneys for Mobile Data Technologies LLC

Date: July 23, 2025

/Naomi L. Birbach/

Naomi L. Birbach

Counsel for Petitioners