

From: [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
To: [Wayne Zou](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
Cc: [OnePlus-Pantech-IPR](#); [Fussell, Tripp](#); [FW-CLIENT-Pantech-OnePlus-Service](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2025-00637 - Request for Supplemental Briefing
Date: Monday, July 21, 2025 10:01:02 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

Petitioner is authorized to file a 1-page brief, limited to addressing the new developments in parallel district court litigation, due no later than Tuesday, July 22, 2025. Patent Owner is authorized to file a 1-page reply, due no later than Wednesday, July 23, 2025.

From: Wayne Zou <wayne.zou@bayes.law>
Sent: Saturday, July 19, 2025 8:25 AM
To: Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>
Cc: OnePlus-Pantech-IPR <OnePlus-Pantech-IPR@bayes.law>; Fussell, Tripp <jfussell@mayerbrown.com>; FW-CLIENT-Pantech-OnePlus-Service <pantech-oneplus-service@mayerbrown.com>
Subject: IPR2025-00637 - Request for Supplemental Briefing

CAUTION: This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. **PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE** before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

Dear Honorable Director,

On July 17, 2025, Petitioner filed its Opposition to Patent Owner's Request for Discretionary Denial in the above-identified proceeding. Shortly afterwards, the Court in the parallel district court litigation *sua sponte* modified certain deadlines in the Docket Control Order and ***vacated*** the current scheduled trial date. *See Pantech Corp. v. OnePlus Tech. (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd.*, 5:24-cv-00038, Dkt. Nos. 85-86 (July 17, 2025) (E.D. Tex.). Both the orders themselves as well as the timestamped ECF notices for those orders are attached for reference.

To ensure the Director is able to consider this new development, Petitioner respectfully requests permission from the Director to submit a supplemental brief, limited to one page, within one day of the Director's approval of this request. This brief would explain the relevance of this new evidence to the discretionary denial analysis, specifically how this development underscores the uncertainty of the trial date in the parallel district court litigation.

To ensure fairness, Petitioner would not oppose Patent Owner submitting a responsive brief of equal length within two days of Petitioner's submission.

Patent Owner has conferred with Petitioner, and Petitioner has agreed to the proposed supplemental briefing, with the following statement:

“Pantech is agreeable to the supplemental briefing as proposed, including the responsive brief of equal length, and do not oppose the outlined procedure.”

The Parties can be available if the Board desires a conference call.

Zhiwei Zou, Lead Counsel on behalf of Petitioner

Wayne Z. Zou, Ph.D.

Partner | Patent Attorney

Bayes PLLC | www.bayes.law

8260 Greensboro Drive, Suite 625 | McLean, VA 22102

O (703) 995-9887 | F (703) 821-8128 | wayne.zou@bayes.law



This e-mail message, including its attachments, is from a law firm and may contain privileged, confidential, or proprietary information or information otherwise exempt from disclosure. The message is intended only for person(s) addressed above. If you believe you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by return e-mail and delete all copies from your mailbox. Thank you.