

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GETTATTLE, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

AFTERWORDS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00677
Patent 10,430,811 B1

Before LINDA E. HORNER, MATTHEW S. MEYERS, and
RYAN H. FLAX, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

FLAX, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Joint Motion to Modify the Schedule
37 C.F.R. § 42.5(c), § 42.71

AfterWords, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) is the owner of U.S. Patent 10,430,811 B1 (Ex. 1001, “the ’811 patent”). Paper 4, 1 (Patent Owner Mandatory Notices). On March 3, 2025, GetTattle, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed a Petition for *inter partes* review challenging the patentability of claims 1–7, 10, 13, 16, 18, and 19 of the ’811 patent. Paper 1, 1 (“Pet.”). Trial was instituted on October 7, 2025. Paper 9.

Upon instituting trial, the Board entered a Scheduling Order. Paper 10. On December 18, 2025, the parties filed a Notice of Joint Stipulation to Extend Due Dates 1–3 in relation to the filing of Patent Owner’s Response, Patent Owner’s Motion to Amend, Petitioner’s Reply to Patent Owner’s Response, and Patent Owner’s Sur-reply to Petitioner’s Reply. Paper 11. In that stipulation, the parties modified Due Date 3 for Patent Owner’s sur-reply from May 5, 2026, to May 19, 2026. *Id.* This stipulation did not, nor could it, modify Due Date 3 as it relates to any filings relating to Patent Owner’s motion to amend. *See* Paper 10, 9–10.

With our authorization (*see* Ex. 3002), the parties now jointly move the Board to modify this proceeding’s Schedule to set Due Date 3, as it relates to the filing of “Patent Owner’s sur-reply to [Petitioner’s] reply and Patent Owner’s reply to [Petitioner’s] opposition to [Patent Owner’s] motion to amend,” to be May 15, 2026. Paper 19 (“Motion”). The parties indicate they have conferred and agreed on the matter because Patent Owner’s counsel has a professional schedule conflict from late April to May 5, 2026 (which was the original Due Date 3). Motion 1.

Although a lead counsel’s conflicting professional schedule is a weak rationale upon which to premise adjusting a proceeding’s schedule given that parties are required to designate backup counsel that, arguably, could

oversee responsibilities in this matter, because the parties are in agreement as to this schedule change, and because it is “modest” and will not prejudice either party, as they also argue, we find good cause exists to *grant* the parties’ joint motion. *See* Motion 1. We, therefore, modify the Schedule in this proceeding to change Due Date 3 as it applies to the filing of (1) Patent Owner’s sur-reply to Petitioner’s reply (to Patent Owner’s response) and (2) Patent Owner’s reply to Petitioner’s opposition to Patent Owner’s motion to amend, to be May 15, 2026.

ORDER

Accordingly, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the parties’ joint Motion is *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Schedule in this proceeding is modified to change Due Date 3 to May 15, 2026, as it applies to the filing of (1) Patent Owner’s sur-reply to Petitioner’s reply (to Patent Owner’s response) and (2) Patent Owner’s reply to Petitioner’s opposition to Patent Owner’s motion to amend;

NO FURTHER relief is presently granted.

IPR2025-00677
Patent 10,430,811 B1

For PETITIONER:

Timothy J. Bechen
Josh Long
Nathan Evans
WOODS ROGERS VANDEVENTER BLACK PLC
timothy.bechen@woodsrogers.com
josh.long@woodsrogers.com
nathan.evans@woodsrogers.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Jeffrey B. Fabian
Samantha Regala
J. Todd Timmerman
SHUMAKER, LOOP & KENDRICK, LLP
jfabian@shumaker.com
sregala@shumaker.com
ttimmerman@shumaker.com