

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

REVVO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

CEREBRUM SENSOR TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00632

Patent 11,835,421

**NOITICE REGARDING DISTRICT COURT SCHEDULING ORDER AND
REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION**

Cerebrum Sensor Technologies, Inc., the Patent Owner, files this notice to keep the Board apprised of a pending District Court action involving the same U.S. Patent No. 11,835,421 that is the subject of this IPR.

For the Board's awareness, the District Court issued an order denying Petitioner's motion for a stay of the action on Oct. 17, 2025. Attached as Exhibit A is that order.

On November 4, 2025, Patent Owner confirmed by email that the parties have claim construction disputes for resolution by the District Court. Attached as Exhibit B is that email.

On November 11, 2025 the parties filed an agreed proposed scheduling order with the Court. Attached as Exhibit C is that proposed scheduling order. The parties' agreed proposed scheduling order provides for the following claim construction deadlines:

1. Patent Owner's Opening Claim Construction Brief – December 3, 2025
2. Petitioner's Answering Claim Construction Brief – December 19, 2025
3. Patent Owner's Reply Claim Construction Brief – February 13, 2026
4. Petitioner's Sur-reply Claim Construction Brief – February 27, 2026
5. Parties' Joint Claim Construction Brief – March 6, 2026
6. Claim Construction Hearing – March/April, 2026

Patent Owner also respectfully seeks clarification regarding the scheduling order entered by the Board, in view of the Director's decision vacating the institution decision. *See* 37 CFR § 42.120 (providing that patent owner may only file "a single response to the petition and/or decision on institution" and setting "date for filing a

patent owner response is three months from the date the inter partes review was instituted”). In view of the Director’s decision vacating the institution decision, Patent Owner understands that its response date is not currently set.

Patent Owner will be prepared to discuss these matters with the Board during the conference call on November 17, 2025.

Dated: November 14, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Christopher D. Bright/

Christopher D. Bright

Reg. No. 46,578

Counsel for Patent Owner

EXHIBIT A

Bright, Christopher

From: ded_nefreply@ded.uscourts.gov
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2025 11:52 AM
To: ded_ecf@ded.uscourts.gov
Subject: Activity in Case 1:24-cv-00245-JLH-SRF Cerebrum Sensor Technologies, Inc. et al v. Revvo Technologies, Inc. Oral Order

[EXTERNAL] ded_nefreply@ded.uscourts.gov

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please DO NOT RESPOND to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS***** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

U.S. District Court

District of Delaware

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered on 10/17/2025 at 2:52 PM EDT and filed on 10/17/2025

Case Name: Cerebrum Sensor Technologies, Inc. et al v. Revvo Technologies, Inc.

Case Number: [1:24-cv-00245-JLH-SRF](#)

Filer:

Document Number: 117(No document attached)

Docket Text:

ORAL ORDER- re [114] Motion to Stay All Deadlines Pending Resolution of *Inter Partes* Review ("IPR"). Having reviewed the parties' submissions, (D.I. 115; D.I. 116), IT IS ORDERED that Defendant's motion to stay the case pending resolution of IPR2025-00631 and IPR2025-00632 is DENIED without prejudice. On balance, the three stay factors do not weigh heavily for or against a stay pending IPR, thus, the decision is a close one. See *IOENGINE, LLC v. PayPal Holdings, Inc.*, C.A. No. 18-452-WCB et al., 2019 WL 3943058, at *2, 4 (D. Del. Aug. 21, 2019) (emphasizing the discretionary nature of the stay inquiry and the need to consider each request on a case-by-case basis). Although a stay is likely to simplify some of the issues for trial based on the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's ("PTAB") institution of IPR proceedings on two of the three patents-in-suit, the fact remains that Defendant chose not to file an IPR petition for U.S. Patent No. 10,137,741 ("the ' 741 patent"). (D.I. 115 at 1) Thus, the asserted claims of the ' 741 patent will go forward in this case even if Defendant is successful in the IPRs. See *Tonal Sys., Inc. v. iFIT Inc.*, C.A. No. 20-1197-GBW-CJB, D.I. 188 (D. Del. Feb. 9, 2023) (D.I. 116, Ex. C). Defendant's submissions to the PTAB indicate that it intends to pursue

system prior art in different combinations in the district court litigation even if it is unsuccessful in the IPRs, and these limitations on estoppel further restrict the scope of any simplification. (D.I. 116, Ex. I at 14; Ex. J at 20; Ex. M at 1 n.1) Moreover, Defendant's invalidity contentions disclose Section 112 defenses that will not be addressed in the IPRs. For example, Defendant asserts indefiniteness, written description, and enablement defenses. (*Id.*, Ex. K at 14-26) Defendant also fails to directly address the impact on these proceedings of a related civil action asserting infringement of recently issued U.S. Patent No. 12,344,051 ("the ' 051 patent"). (D.I. 115 at 3) The record before the court confirms that the ' 051 patent raises overlapping issues and, to date, Defendant has not filed an IPR petition on the ' 051 patent. (D.I. 116, Ex. L at ¶ 4) Finally, the IPRs will not fully resolve the claim construction issues in this litigation. Defendant has adopted many of Plaintiffs' proposed claim constructions for purposes of the IPRs, with the exception of the term "cavity" in certain dependent claims of the challenged patents (which relate to tire sensor technology). (D.I. 116 at 3, Exs. G-H) But the ' 741 patent presents disputed claim terms, such as the "vulcanized to[gether]" term, which will not be addressed in the IPRs. (D.I. 116 at 3, Exs. G-H; D.I. 84, Ex. A at 2) Should the potential for inconsistent claim construction rulings arise from parallel IPR proceedings before the PTAB and *Markman* proceedings in this court, the court may address such issues through case management procedures at the appropriate time. Therefore, the simplification factor does not weigh heavily for or against a stay. (D.I. 116, Ex. C) Second, the status of the litigation is neutral or weighs slightly in favor of Defendant. The parties have conducted substantial fact discovery, although the *Markman* briefing and proceedings, expert discovery, case dispositive motions, and trial remain to be completed. (D.I. 116, Ex. C) Third, the undue prejudice factor weighs slightly against a stay. There is no dispute that Cerebrum Sensor Technologies, Inc. directly competes with Defendant, a point Defendant asserts in its answer and counterclaims. (D.I. 95 at ¶¶ 8, 11, 21, 97-98, 104, 114) Although Defendant presents attorney argument minimizing the amount of competition between the parties, it does not offer any evidence in support of these assertions despite carrying the burden on this motion. (D.I. 115 at 4; D.I. 116, Ex. C) When the parties are direct competitors, the delay caused by a stay gives rise to "outsized consequences to the party asserting infringement has occurred," even when there are other competitors in the market. *N. Atl. Imports, LLC v. LoCo-Crazy Good Cookers, Inc.*, C.A. No. 23-999-GBW-SRF, 2024 WL 4827250, at *4 (D. Del. Nov. 19, 2024) (citing cases). The prior stay in this case to facilitate settlement discussions does not weigh against Plaintiffs, who submitted a declaration supporting their position that their good faith settlement efforts were met with some resistance and delay. (D.I. 116, Ex. A at ¶¶ 16-17) The timing of Defendant's IPR petitions does not weigh against Defendant even though the petitions were filed near the end of the statutory deadline because it was reasonable for Defendant to wait for a decision on its motion to dismiss and the receipt of Plaintiffs' proposed claim constructions before submitting its IPR petitions. (D.I. 115 at 4) On balance, the stay factors are "close to neutral," and "a clear case for a stay has not been made." (D.I. 116, Ex. C) IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, on or before October 30, 2025, the parties shall submit a joint proposed order amending the scheduling order at D.I. 38. The court will determine whether to set a Rule 16 scheduling conference upon review of the joint proposed amended order. Ordered by Judge Sherry R. Fallon on 10/17/2025. (lih)

1:24-cv-00245-JLH-SRF Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Karen Jacobs kjacobs@mnat.com, kjlefilng@mnat.com, mnat_IP_eFiling@morrisnichols.com

Kelly E. Farnan farnan@rlf.com, linda-loveless-5548@ecf.pacerpro.com, loveless@rlf.com

Christopher D. Bright cbright@swlaw.com, ocecfc@swlaw.com

Morgan Povinelli mpovinelli@swlaw.com

Christopher Franich cfranich@swlaw.com, labraham@swlaw.com

Edward Paul Steingraber esteingraber@morrisnichols.com

1:24-cv-00245-JLH-SRF Filer will deliver document by other means to:

EXHIBIT B

Bright, Christopher

From: Bright, Christopher
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 2:58 PM
To: Pivovar, Adam; Ying, Jennifer; Kelly E. Farnan; Sara Metzler; Chen, Reuben; Preston, Rachel L
Cc: Jacobs, Karen; Steingraber, Paul; Tipton, Cole
Subject: RE: Cerebrum / Revvo - C.A. No. 24-245

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Adam,

The parties' joint claim construction statement says: "The Joint Claim Construction Chart at Exhibit A includes the terms for which the parties have met-and-conferred and identified for claim construction at this stage of the case ... " D.I. 84 at 1 n.1.

Cerebrum is not willing to defer those claim construction disputes and plans to address them in claim construction briefing for the Court.

Thanks,

Chris Bright

📞 714.427.7069
cbright@swlaw.com

**SNELL
& WILMER**

swlaw.com | LinkedIn

From: Pivovar, Adam <apivovar@cooley.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 2:13 PM
To: Bright, Christopher <cbright@swlaw.com>; Ying, Jennifer <jying@morrisnichols.com>; Kelly E. Farnan <farnan@rlf.com>; Sara Metzler <metzler@rlf.com>; Chen, Reuben <rchen@cooley.com>; Preston, Rachel L <RPreston@cooley.com>
Cc: Jacobs, Karen <KJacobs@morrisnichols.com>; Steingraber, Paul <esteingraber@morrisnichols.com>; Tipton, Cole <ctipton@swlaw.com>
Subject: RE: Cerebrum / Revvo - C.A. No. 24-245

[EXTERNAL] apivovar@cooley.com

Chris,

The vast majority of Plaintiffs' proposed constructions say "plain and ordinary meaning." We think the parties would benefit from having the Court focus on the resolution on the two terms as we've flagged at this stage since they are in all of the independent claims of the respective asserted patents and is where the parties have the most material disputes regarding claim interpretation.

I am out of the office the rest of today and all day tomorrow, so we may need to seek another extension to try to reach an agreement.

Thanks,
Adam

Adam M. Pivovar, Ph.D.

Cooley LLP
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW • Suite 700
(enter from 12th and E Streets)
Washington, DC 20004-2400
Direct: (202) 842 7889 • Fax: (202) 842 7899 • Cell: (301) 518 9212
Bio: www.cooley.com/apivovar • Practice: www.cooley.com/litigation

From: Bright, Christopher <cbright@swlaw.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 4:25 PM
To: Pivovar, Adam <apivovar@cooley.com>; Ying, Jennifer <jying@morrisnichols.com>; Kelly E. Farnan <farnan@rlf.com>; Sara Metzler <metzler@rlf.com>; Chen, Reuben <rchen@cooley.com>; Preston, Rachel L <RPreston@cooley.com>
Cc: Jacobs, Karen <KJacobs@morrisnichols.com>; Steingraber, Paul <esteingraber@morrisnichols.com>; Tipton, Cole <ctipton@swlaw.com>
Subject: RE: Cerebrum / Revvo - C.A. No. 24-245

As you know, Revvo demanded that Cerebrum propose constructions for those terms, and Cerebrum did so.

Chris Bright

☎: 714.427.7069
cbright@swlaw.com

**SNELL
& WILMER**

swlaw.com | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Pivovar, Adam <apivovar@cooley.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 10:09 AM
To: Bright, Christopher <cbright@swlaw.com>; Ying, Jennifer <jying@morrisnichols.com>; Kelly E. Farnan <farnan@rlf.com>; Sara Metzler <metzler@rlf.com>; Chen, Reuben <rchen@cooley.com>; Preston, Rachel L <RPreston@cooley.com>
Cc: Jacobs, Karen <KJacobs@morrisnichols.com>; Steingraber, Paul <esteingraber@morrisnichols.com>; Tipton, Cole <ctipton@swlaw.com>
Subject: RE: Cerebrum / Revvo - C.A. No. 24-245

[EXTERNAL] apivovar@cooley.com

No. I thought that all of Plaintiffs' proposals were plain and ordinary meaning to a POSA. Hence, we would agree to no construction necessary (i.e., plain meaning) on the rest.

Adam M. Pivovar, Ph.D.

Cooley LLP
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW • Suite 700
(enter from 12th and E Streets)
Washington, DC 20004-2400
Direct: (202) 842 7889 • Fax: (202) 842 7899 • Cell: (301) 518 9212
Bio: www.cooley.com/apivovar • Practice: www.cooley.com/litigation

From: Bright, Christopher <cbright@swlaw.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 11:55 AM

To: Pivovar, Adam <apivovar@cooley.com>; Ying, Jennifer <jying@morrisnichols.com>; Kelly E. Farnan <farnan@rlf.com>; Sara Metzler <metzler@rlf.com>; Chen, Reuben <rchen@cooley.com>; Preston, Rachel L <RPreston@cooley.com>

Cc: Jacobs, Karen <KJacobs@morrisnichols.com>; Steingraber, Paul <esteingraber@morrisnichols.com>; Tipton, Cole <ctipton@swlaw.com>

Subject: RE: Cerebrum / Revvo - C.A. No. 24-245

Counsel for Revvo,

For clarification, is Revvo agreeing to all of Cerebrum's claim constructions except for the two terms identified in your email?

Chris Bright

☎: 714.427.7069
cbright@swlaw.com

**SNELL
& WILMER**

swlaw.com | [LinkedIn](#)

From: Pivovar, Adam <apivovar@cooley.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 8:08 AM

To: Ying, Jennifer <jying@morrisnichols.com>; Kelly E. Farnan <farnan@rlf.com>; Sara Metzler <metzler@rlf.com>; Chen, Reuben <rchen@cooley.com>; Preston, Rachel L <RPreston@cooley.com>

Cc: Jacobs, Karen <KJacobs@morrisnichols.com>; Steingraber, Paul <esteingraber@morrisnichols.com>; Bright, Christopher <cbright@swlaw.com>; Tipton, Cole <ctipton@swlaw.com>

Subject: RE: Cerebrum / Revvo - C.A. No. 24-245

[EXTERNAL] apivovar@cooley.com

Counsel,

Please find attached our revisions to the dates for the amended scheduling order, which only shifts the dates slightly from what you had proposed to account for the upcoming holidays and other case schedule conflicts for Revvo's counsel.

Second, to most efficiently move the case forward considering the relative small sizes of the parties, Revvo's proposal is contingent on the parties agreeing to narrow the issues in dispute for claim construction to just two terms, as follows:

- '421 patent – "(a) housing"
- '741 patent - "vulcanized"/"vulcanized to(gether)"

If Plaintiffs will not agree to the foregoing claim construction narrowing, Revvo intends to ask the Court to resolve these dispositive terms in an initial claim construction phase distinct from the remaining issues in the case.

Please let us know if you agree to this proposals or would like to discuss further.

Thanks,
Adam

Adam M. Pivovar, Ph.D.

Cooley LLP
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW • Suite 700
(enter from 12th and E Streets)
Washington, DC 20004-2400
Direct: (202) 842 7889 • Fax: (202) 842 7899 • Cell: (301) 518 9212
Bio: www.cooley.com/apivovar • Practice: www.cooley.com/litigation

From: Ying, Jennifer <jying@morrisnichols.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 7:37 PM

To: Kelly E. Farnan <farnan@rlf.com>; Sara Metzler <metzler@rlf.com>; Chen, Reuben <rchen@cooley.com>; Preston, Rachel L <RPreston@cooley.com>; Pivovar, Adam <apivovar@cooley.com>

Cc: Jacobs, Karen <KJacobs@morrisnichols.com>; Steingraber, Paul <esteingraber@morrisnichols.com>; Bright, Christopher <cbright@swlaw.com>; Tipton, Cole <ctipton@swlaw.com>

Subject: Cerebrum / Revvo - C.A. No. 24-245

Counsel:

Please find attached a proposed schedule of new dates in the attached Appendix A. Please note that we have not yet updated the body of the scheduling order; once the parties have reached agreement on the list of dates in the Appendix A, we can carry that forward into the body.

Please let us know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further.

Best
Jennifer

This message, including any accompanying documents or attachments, may contain information that is confidential or that is privileged.

If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please note that the dissemination, distribution, use or copying of this message

or any of the accompanying documents or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you believe that you may have received this message in error, please contact me at (302) 658-9200 or by return e-mail.

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. If you are the intended recipient, please be advised that the content of this message is subject to access, review and disclosure by the sender's Email System Administrator.

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. If you are the intended recipient, please be advised that the content of this message is subject to access, review and disclosure by the sender's Email System Administrator.

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. If you are the intended recipient, please be advised that the content of this message is subject to access, review and disclosure by the sender's Email System Administrator.

EXHIBIT C

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CEREBRUM SENSOR TECHNOLOGIES,	)	
INC. and TIRE STICKERS LLC,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 24-245 (JLH) (SRF)
	)	
REVVO TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

[JOINT PROPOSED] AMENDED SCHEDULING ORDER

This ____ day of November, 2025, the Court having issued an Oral Order [114] for the parties to submit a joint proposed order amending the scheduling order at D.I. 38; IT IS ORDERED that:

1. **Joinder of Other Parties and Amendment of Pleadings.** No further joinder or amendment of pleadings at this time, subject to amendments pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 for good cause.

2. **Discovery.**¹ All fact discovery in this case shall be initiated so that it will be completed on or before October 8, 2026. All expert discovery in this case shall be initiated so that it will be completed on or before January 22, 2027. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, the limitations on discovery set forth in Local Rule 26.1 shall be strictly observed.

a. **Rule 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures.** On September 27, 2024, the parties made their initial disclosures pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1).

¹ Should the parties agree to modify the number of depositions under FED. R. CIV. P. 30, the number of allowed interrogatories under Rule 33 or limit the number of requests for production and/or requests for admission under Rules 34 and 36 respectively, they shall include the appropriate proposed provisions in this Order.

b. E-Discovery Default Standard. If they have not already done so, the parties are to review the Default Standard for Discovery of Electronic Documents, which is posted on Magistrate Judge Fallon’s section of the Court’s website (<http://www.ded.uscourts.gov>) under the “Guidelines” tab, and is incorporated herein by reference.

c. Document Production. Document production shall be substantially complete on or before June 19, 2026.

d. Interrogatories. A maximum of 25 interrogatories shall be served by each party to any other party.

e. Contention Interrogatories. Except as set forth below, in the absence of agreement among the parties, contention interrogatories, if filed, shall first be addressed by the party with the burden of proof no later than the date established for the completion of document production, with the responsive answers due within thirty (30) days thereof. The adequacy of all such interrogatory answers shall be judged by the level of detail each party provides; i.e., the more detail a party provides, the more detail a party shall receive.

i. Infringement and Invalidity Contentions.

(1) Initial Contentions. On October 30, 2024, Plaintiff served an initial claim chart relating each known accused product to the asserted claims each such product allegedly infringes, as supplemented on November 7, 2024 and November 21, 2024. On November 27, 2024, Defendant served its initial invalidity contentions for each asserted claim, as well as the known related invalidating references.

a. Case Narrowing – Initial Contentions. Initial Contentions should not be narrowed before substantial discovery is completed.

(2) Final Contentions. By July 31, 2026, Plaintiff shall provide final infringement contentions. By September 4, 2026, Defendant shall provide final invalidity contentions.

a. Case Narrowing – Final Contentions. In the Final Infringement Contentions, Plaintiff shall assert no more than 18 total asserted claims. In the Final Invalidity Contentions, Defendant shall assert no more than 18 total prior art theories, where each “theory” refers to a single invalidity theory (i.e., anticipation or a specific obviousness combination with no “and/or” alternatives as part of the combination), and no more than two (2) non-prior art invalidity theories per asserted claim, absent leave of court.

f. Requests for Admission. A maximum of 50 requests for admission shall be served by each party to any other party, except for requests for admission of the admissibility of evidence under the Federal Rules of Evidence.

g. Depositions.

i. Timing. In the absence of agreement among the parties or by order of the court, no deposition (other than those noticed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6)) shall be scheduled prior to the completion of document production.

ii. Limitation on Hours for Deposition Discovery. Each side is limited to a maximum of 49 hours for taking fact depositions of the other side (exclusive of third-party depositions which shall not count toward this hours limitation).

iii. Location of Depositions. Any party or representative (officer, director, or managing agent) of a party filing a civil action in this district court must ordinarily be required, upon request, to submit to a deposition at a place designated within this district. Exceptions to this general rule may be made by order of the Court. A defendant who becomes a

counterclaimant, cross-claimant, or third-party plaintiff shall be considered as having filed an action in this Court for the purpose of this provision.

h. Disclosure of Expert Testimony.

i. For the party who has the initial burden of proof on the subject matter, the initial Federal Rule 26(a)(2) disclosure of expert testimony is due on or before November 6, 2026.

ii. The supplemental disclosure to contradict or rebut evidence on the same matter identified by another party is due on or before December 4, 2026.

iii. Reply expert reports from the party with the initial burden of proof are due on or before December 23, 2026.

iv. No other expert reports will be permitted without either the consent of all parties or leave of the Court. Along with the submissions of the expert reports, the parties shall advise of the dates and times of their experts' availability for deposition. Expert discovery shall close by January 22, 2027.

i. Objections to Expert Testimony. To the extent any objection to expert testimony is made pursuant to the principles announced in *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993), as incorporated in Federal Rule of Evidence 702, it shall be made by motion no later than the deadline for dispositive motions set forth herein, unless otherwise ordered by the Court. Briefing on such motions is subject to the page limits set out in connection with briefing of case dispositive motions.

j. Fact Witnesses to be Called at Trial.

i. Within one (1) month following the close of expert discovery, each party shall serve on the other parties a list of each fact witness (including any expert witness who

is also expected to give fact testimony), who has previously been disclosed during discovery and that it intends to call at trial.

ii. Within one (1) month of receipt of such fact witness list, each party shall serve a list of each rebuttal fact witness that it intends to call at trial.

iii. The parties shall have the right to depose any such fact witnesses who have not previously been deposed in this case. Such deposition shall be held within one (1) month after service of the list of rebuttal fact witnesses and shall be limited to twenty (20) hours per side in the aggregate unless extended by agreement of the parties or upon order of the court upon good cause shown.

k. Discovery Matters and Disputes Relating to Protective Orders.

i. Should counsel find they are unable to resolve a discovery matter or those other matters covered by this paragraph,² the moving party (*i.e.*, the party seeking relief from the Court) shall file a “[Joint] Motion for Teleconference To Resolve [Protective Order or Discovery] Dispute.” The suggested text for this motion can be found in Magistrate Judge Fallon’s section of the Court’s website in the “Forms” tab, under the heading “Discovery Matters–Motion to Resolve Discovery Disputes.”

ii. The Court will thereafter order a discovery telephone conference and deadlines for submissions. On the date set by the Court, generally not less than seventy-two (72) hours prior to the conference, excluding weekends and holidays, the party seeking relief shall file with the Court a letter, not to exceed four (4) pages, in no less than 12-point font, outlining the issues in dispute and its position on those issues. This submission shall include a proposed order,

² Counsel are expected to ***verbally*** discuss the issues/concerns before seeking the Court’s intervention.

attached as an exhibit, setting out the nature of the relief requested. The parties shall file any exhibits associated with their respective letter submissions as separate, individual attachments within the docket entry for the letter.

iii. On the date set by the Court, generally not less than forty-eight (48) hours prior to the conference, excluding weekends and holidays, any party opposing the application for relief may file a letter, not to exceed four (4) pages, in no less than 12-point font, outlining that party's reason for its opposition.

iv. Two (2) courtesy copies of the letters are to be hand delivered to the Clerk's Office within one hour of e-filing. All courtesy copies shall be double-sided.

v. Should the Court find further briefing necessary upon conclusion of the telephone conference, the Court will order it.

vi. Disputes or issues regarding protective orders, or motions for extension of time for briefing case dispositive motions which are related to discovery matters are to be addressed in accordance with this paragraph.

3. **Application to Court for Protective Order.** The Court has already entered a Stipulated Protective Order in this case (D.I. 18). Should counsel find it will be necessary to apply to the Court for a modified protective order specifying different terms and conditions for the disclosure of confidential information, counsel should confer and attempt to reach an agreement on a modified proposed form of order and submit it to the Court. Should counsel be unable to reach an agreement on a proposed form of protective order, counsel must follow the provisions of Paragraph 2(j) above.

Any proposed protective order should include the following paragraph:

Other Proceedings. By entering this order and limiting the disclosure of information in this litigation, the Court does not intend to preclude another

court from finding that information may be relevant and subject to disclosure in another case. Any person or party subject to this order who in other proceedings becomes subject to a motion to disclose another party's information designated "confidential" [the parties should list any other level of designation, such as "highly confidential," which may be provided for in the protective order] pursuant to this order shall promptly notify that party of the motion so that party may have an opportunity to appear and be heard in the other proceeding.

4. **Papers Filed Under Seal.** When filing papers under seal, counsel should deliver to the Clerk an original and one (1) copy of the papers. In accordance with section G of the Administrative Procedures Governing Filing and Service by Electronic Means, a redacted version of any sealed document shall be filed electronically within seven (7) days of the filing of the sealed document.

5. **Courtesy Copies.** The parties shall provide to the Court two (2) courtesy copies of all briefs and one (1) courtesy copy of any other document filed in support of any briefs (i.e., appendices, exhibits, declarations, affidavits, etc.). This provision also applies to papers filed under seal.

6. **Interim Status Report.** Fourteen (14) days after the Court's claim construction order, counsel shall submit a joint interim report to the Court on the nature of the matters in issue and the progress of discovery to date.

7. **Status Conference.** On November ___, 2025, the Court will hold a Rule 16(a), (b) and (c) conference by telephone with counsel beginning at 2:00 P.M. Plaintiff's counsel shall initiate the telephone call. At the time of this conference, counsel shall also be prepared to discuss the progress, if any, of settlement discussions and shall be prepared to discuss the possibility of setting up a settlement conference with the Court, counsel and their clients. If all parties agree that there is nothing to report, nor anything to add to the interim status report or to this order, they shall

notify the Court in writing before the conference is scheduled to occur, and the conference will be taken off of the Court's calendar.

8. **Claim Construction Issue Identification.** The Joint Claim Construction chart was filed on January 22, 2025. (D.I. 84).

9. **Claim Construction Briefing.** The Plaintiff shall serve, but not file, its opening brief, not to exceed 20 pages, on December 3, 2025. The Defendant shall serve, but not file, its answering brief, not to exceed 30 pages, on January 14, 2026. The Plaintiff shall serve, but not file, its reply brief, not to exceed 20 pages, on February 13, 2026. The Defendant shall serve, but not file, its sur-reply brief, not to exceed 10 pages, on February 27, 2026. No later than March 6, 2026, the parties shall file a Joint Claim Construction Brief. The parties shall copy and paste their unfiled briefs into one brief, with their positions on each claim term in sequential order, in substantially the form below.

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEF

I. Agreed-upon Constructions

II. Disputed Constructions

A. [TERM 1]

1. Plaintiff's Opening Position
2. Defendant's Answering Position
3. Plaintiff's Reply Position
4. Defendant's Sur-Reply Position

B. [TERM 2]

1. Plaintiff's Opening Position
2. Defendant's Answering Position

3. Plaintiff's Reply Position

4. Defendant's Sur-Reply Position

The parties need not include any general summaries of the law relating to claim construction. If there are any materials that would be submitted in an appendix, the parties shall submit them in a Joint Appendix.

10. Beginning at ___ a.m. on March/April ___, 2026, the Court will hear evidence and argument on claim construction. The parties shall notify the Court, by joint letter submission, no later than the date on which the Joint Claim Construction Brief is due: (i) whether they request leave to present testimony at the hearing; and (ii) the amount of time they would like to have allocated to them for the hearing.

11. The court shall issue its decision on claim construction on or before _____.

12. Case Dispositive Motions.

All case dispositive motions, an opening brief, and affidavits, if any, in support of the motion shall be served and filed on or before February 19, 2027 [calculated so that briefing is completed approximately four months prior to the pretrial conference]. Answering briefs will be due by March 19, 2027, and reply briefs will be due by April 9, 2027. No case dispositive motion under Rule 56 may be filed more than ten days before the above date without leave of the Court.

a. Concise Statement of Facts Requirement. Any motion for summary judgment shall be accompanied by a separate concise statement, not to exceed six pages, which details each material fact that the moving party contends is essential for the Court's resolution of the summary judgment motion (not the entire case) and as to which the moving party contends

there is no genuine issue to be tried. Each fact shall be set forth in a separate numbered paragraph and shall be supported by specific citation(s) to the record.

Any party opposing the motion shall include with its opposing papers a response to the moving party's concise statement, not to exceed six pages, which admits or disputes the facts set forth in the moving party's concise statement on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. To the extent a fact is disputed, the basis of the dispute shall be supported by specific citation(s) to the record. Failure to respond to a fact presented in the moving party's concise statement of facts shall indicate that fact is not in dispute for purposes of summary judgment. The party opposing the motion may also include with its opposing papers a separate concise statement, not to exceed four pages, which sets forth material facts as to which the opposing party contends there is a genuine issue to be tried. Each fact asserted by the opposing party shall also be set forth in a separate numbered paragraph and shall be supported by specific citation(s) to the record.

b. The moving party shall include with its reply papers a response to the opposing party's concise statement of facts, not to exceed four pages, on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

c. Page limits combined with *Daubert* motion page limits. Each party is permitted to file as many case dispositive motions as desired, provided, however, that each side will be limited to a combined total of 40 pages for all opening briefs, a combined total of 40 pages for all answering briefs, and a combined total of 20 pages for all reply briefs. In the event that a party files, in addition to a case dispositive motion, a *Daubert* motion to exclude or preclude all or any portion of an expert's testimony, the total amount of pages permitted for all case dispositive

and *Daubert* motions shall be increased to 50 pages for all opening briefs, 50 pages for all answering briefs, and 25 pages for all reply briefs for each *side*.³

d. Hearing. The Court will hear argument on all pending case dispositive and *Daubert* motions on TBD. [a date approximately two months prior to the requested pretrial conference date]. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, each side will be allocated a total of forty-five minutes to present its argument on all pending motions.

13. Applications by Motion. Except as otherwise specified herein, any application to the Court shall be by written motion. Any non-dispositive motion should contain the statement required by Local Rule 7.1.1.

14. Amendments to the Scheduling Order. Any stipulation or other request to amend the scheduling order shall include a chart that lists each court-ordered event with a deadline/date (even if it is not being changed), the current deadline/date, and the new proposed deadline/date.

15. IPRs/PGRs. Any party asserting a patent must file a “Notice of IPR/PGR Event” within seven days of any of the following actions taken on that patent: petition for inter partes review/post grant review (regardless of whether a party filed the petition), institution decision, final written decision, appeal to the Federal Circuit, Federal Circuit decision. The Notice must list the action taken, the affected claims, the dates of any expected further action by the PTAB, and the status of all other pending IPRs/PGRs.

16. Motions in Limine. Motions *in limine* shall not be separately filed. All *in limine* requests and responses thereto shall be set forth in the proposed pretrial order. Each side shall be

³ The parties must work together to ensure that the Court receives no more than a *total* of 250 pages (*i.e.*, 50 + 50 + 25 regarding one side’s motions, and 50 + 50 + 25 regarding the other side’s motions) of briefing on all case dispositive motions and *Daubert* motions that are covered by this scheduling order and any other scheduling order entered in any related case that is proceeding on a consolidated or coordinated pretrial schedule.

limited to three *in limine* requests, unless otherwise permitted by the Court. The *in limine* request and any response shall contain the authorities relied upon. Each *in limine* request may be supported by a maximum of three pages of argument, may be opposed by a maximum of three pages of argument, and the side making the *in limine* request may add a maximum of one additional page in reply in support of its request. If more than one party is supporting or opposing an *in limine* request, such support or opposition shall be combined in a single three-page submission (and, if the moving party, a single one page reply), unless otherwise ordered by the Court. No separate briefing shall be submitted on *in limine* requests, unless otherwise permitted by the Court.

17. Pretrial Conference. On July ___, 2027, the Court will hold a pretrial conference in Court with counsel. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, the parties should assume that filing the pretrial order satisfies the pretrial disclosure requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(3). The parties shall file with the Court the joint proposed final pretrial order in compliance with Local Rule 16.3(c) not later than seven days before the pretrial conference. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court or agreed by the parties, the parties shall comply with the timeframes set forth in Local Rule 16.3(d)(1)-(3) for the preparation of the joint proposed final pretrial order.

The proposed final pretrial order shall contain a table of contents. The parties shall provide the Court two double-sided courtesy copies of the joint proposed final pretrial order and all attachments.

18. Jury Instructions, Voir Dire, and Special Verdict Forms. Where a case is to be tried to a jury, pursuant to Local Rules 47.1(a)(2) and 51.1, the parties should file (i) proposed voir dire, (ii) preliminary jury instructions, (iii) final jury instructions, and (iv) special verdict forms seven days before the final pretrial conference. This submission shall be accompanied by a courtesy

copy containing electronic files of these documents in Microsoft Word format, which should be submitted by e-mail to jlh_civil@ded.uscourts.gov.

19. Trial. This matter is scheduled for a five (5)⁴ day [jury/bench] trial beginning at 9:30 a.m. on July ___, 2027 with the subsequent trial days beginning at 9:00 a.m. Until the case is submitted to the jury for deliberations, the jury will be excused each day at 5:00 p.m. The trial will be timed, and counsel will be allocated a total number of hours in which to present their respective cases.

20. Judgment on Verdict and Post-Trial Status Report. Within seven days after a jury returns a verdict in any portion of a jury trial, the parties shall jointly submit a form of order to enter judgment on the verdict. At the same time, the parties shall submit a joint status report, indicating among other things how the case should proceed and listing any post-trial motions each party intends to file.

21. Post-Trial Motions. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, all sides are limited to a maximum of 20 pages of opening briefs, 20 pages of answering briefs, and 10 pages of reply briefs relating to any post-trial motions filed by that side, no matter how many such motions are filed.

A Proposed Chart of All Relevant Deadlines is provided in **Appendix A**.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

⁴ Five days (*i.e.*, about ten to thirteen hours per side) is the presumptive length of a patent jury trial. If the parties think it is obvious that this will not be enough, they may put in a different length and should be prepared to explain why at the Rule 16 conference. A final decision on the precise length of trial will not be made before the final pretrial conference.

Appendix A
Chart of All Relevant Deadlines

EVENT	ORIGINAL DEADLINE	NEW DEADLINE
Plaintiff serves opening claim construction brief and any expert declaration in support thereof	February 19, 2025	December 3, 2025
Deposition of Plaintiff's claim construction expert	March 7, 2025	December 19, 2025
Defendant serves answering claim construction brief and any expert declaration in support thereof	March 19, 2025	January 14, 2026
Deposition of Defendant's claim construction expert	April 4, 2025	January 30, 2026
Plaintiff serves reply claim construction brief	April 9, 2025	February 13, 2026
Defendant serves sur-reply claim construction brief	April 30, 2025	February 27, 2026
Parties file joint claim construction brief	May 7, 2025	March 6, 2026
Parties to meet and confer and file amended joint claim construction chart (if necessary)	June 11, 2025	March 13, 2026
Claim construction hearing	June 25, 2025 at 11:00 a.m.	March/April __, 2026
Interim Status Report	June 27, 2025	+14 days after Claim Construction Order
Substantial completion of document production	August 29, 2025	June 19, 2026
Final infringement contentions	October 24, 2025	July 31, 2026
Final invalidity contentions	November 21, 2025	September 4, 2026

EVENT	ORIGINAL DEADLINE	NEW DEADLINE
Close of fact discovery	December 19, 2025	October 8, 2026
Opening expert reports on issues for which the party bears the burden of proof	January 23, 2026	November 6, 2026
Rebuttal expert reports	February 20, 2026	December 4, 2026
Reply expert reports	March 13, 2026	December 23, 2026
Close of expert discovery	April 17, 2026	January 22, 2027
Dispositive/ <i>Daubert</i> Motions	May 16, 2026	February 19, 2027
Answering Briefs to Dispositive/ <i>Daubert</i> Motions	June 16, 2026	March 19, 2027
Replies in support of Dispositive/ <i>Daubert</i> Motions	June 30, 2026	April 9, 2027
Hearing on Dispositive/ <i>Daubert</i> Motions	TBD	TBD
Pretrial Order, Jury instructions, Voir Dire and Verdict form	[7 days before Pretrial Conference]	[7 days before Pretrial Conference]
Pretrial Conference	TBD	July ____ 2027
Trial	TBD	July ____ 2027