

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC
Petitioner

v.

SANDPIPER CDN, LLC,
Patent Owner

Case IPR2025-00860
U.S. Patent No. 10,924,573

**PATENT OWNER'S
REPLY BRIEF ON DISCRETIONARY DENIAL**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE <i>FINTIV</i> FACTORS STRONGLY FAVOR DENIAL.	1
A.	Factor One favors denial because the evidence indicates a stay will not be granted.	1
B.	Factor Two strongly favors denial because the district court trial will occur months before the projected FWD.	2
C.	Factor Three strongly favors denial because there will be significant investment and Petitioner was not diligent.	3
D.	Factors Four through Six continue to strongly favor denial.	4
III.	CONCLUSION	4

Pursuant to the authorization granted by e-mail (EX3101), Sandpiper CDN, LLC (“Sandpiper”) submits this reply to Petitioner’s Opposition (“Opp.”) to Patent Owner’s Request for Discretionary Denial of Institution (“DD Req.”).

I. INTRODUCTION

The Director should exercise discretion to deny institution. The *Fintiv* analysis strongly favors discretionary denial. Contrary to Petitioner’s misleading arguments, there is no permanent stay in place and the district court has indicated a strong intention to maintain its trial date—which will occur *months* before the projected final written decision deadline here. Accordingly, the district court is a faster and more efficient forum to resolve the parties’ dispute in this proceeding.

II. THE *FINTIV* FACTORS STRONGLY FAVOR DENIAL.

A. Factor One favors denial because the evidence indicates a stay will not be granted.

The district court has *not* granted a stay of this proceeding—rather, it merely issued a short “pause” to allow the PTAB to conduct its discretionary analysis “while at the same time preserve the trial date in this case.” EX2006, 4-5. Without any supporting citation, Petitioner alleges the “Court has indicated openness to consider staying all or part of the case if only a subset of asserted patents were subject to IPR.” Opp., 16. No such indication exists. The only indication is that *if* the PTAB were to institute on *all* of the petitions, Sandpiper would stipulate to a stay. EX2006, 4. Given the strong reasons for denial (based, at least, on the *Fintiv*

analysis and the serious flaws in the merits of the petition), the likelihood that all proceedings will be instituted is remote. Thus, factor one favors denial.

B. Factor Two strongly favors denial because the district court trial will occur months before the projected FWD.

Petitioner mischaracterizes the effect of the pause on the trial date. *Contra* Opp., 16. There is zero indication that the trial date will be delayed because of the pause—in fact, the district court indicated just the opposite. Specifically, the court noted that the “parties agreed to a lengthier case schedule than the Court would have typically entered” and that “a short-term workable solution” is to move certain interim dates, while preserving the trial date. EX2006, 4-5. The table below specifically notes there is **no change** to the trial date.

Event	Current Date	New Date
Completion of Claim Construction Discovery	7/18/25	No change
Opening claim construction briefs	8/8/25	11/21/25
Responsive claim construction briefs	8/22/25	12/19/25
Technology Tutorial	8/29/25	1/9/26 at 10:00 a.m.
Claim construction hearing	9/12/25	1/23/26 at 10:00 a.m.
Fact discovery cutoff	1/30/26	3/27/26
Opening expert reports	2/20/26	4/10/26
Rebuttal expert reports	3/27/26	5/8/26
Close of expert discovery	4/17/26	5/22/26
Last day to hear motions	6/26/26	No change
Settlement conference deadline	7/10/26	No change
Trial filings (first round)	7/31/26	No change
Trial filings (second round)	8/14/26	No change
Final Pretrial conference	9/11/26 at 11:00 a.m.	No change
Jury trial	9/28/26	No change

EX2006, 5 (highlighting added).

When a limited stay (or here a pause) is in place, the proper analysis is to

consider the effect the pause has on whether the FWD will occur before the trial date. *See Amazon.com, Inc. v. Kaifi LLC*, IPR2025-00624 et seq., Paper 16 (P.T.A.B. July 29, 2025). Here the district court has strongly indicted there will be *no effect* on the trial date—which is highly likely given the former schedule was “lengthier” than usual. EX2006, 5. Therefore, the trial will occur well over *two months* before the projected FWD date of December 10, 2026. Even in the unlikely event there is a slight delay (e.g., to adjust for the one month delay for the close of expert discovery), this still puts the trial date *at least* six weeks before the projected final written decision. Further, Petitioner misrepresents that its median time to trial stats put the trial within a few weeks of the expected FWD. *Contra* Opp., 17. Those stats put the trial date at approximately October 10, 2026 (29 months after the May 10, 2024 filing date of the complaint)—which is *two months* before the projected FWD date. Moreover, Petitioner does not provide any reasoning why its median time to trial stats apply given the strong indication that the trial date will be maintained. Thus, factor two *strongly* favors denial.

C. Factor Three strongly favors denial because there will be significant investment and Petitioner was not diligent.

Factor three strongly favors denial. At the time of the relevant December 2025 institution decision date, claim construction discovery will be complete, opening claim construction briefs will be exchanged, and Markman will occur shortly thereafter. *See* EX2006. And the district court has also invested substantial

effort in deciding multiple substantive motions. Opp., 15-16. Further, Petitioner was not diligent here—it waited more than eleven months after the complaint to file this IPR.

D. Factors Four through Six continue to strongly favor denial.

Factors 4-6 strongly favor denial for the reasons discussed in Sandpiper’s initial brief. *See* DD. Br., 17-18. For example, the parallel litigation involves the same claims and defenses and Petitioner’s *Sotera* stipulation does not mitigate concerns of duplicate effort—indeed it preserves the right to raise invalidity grounds based on the *same* art in this IPR combined with system art. Additionally, the merits are weak. *See* DD. Br., 19-25 (discussing the fundamental flaws in Petitioner’s challenges).

III. CONCLUSION

All six Fintiv factors strongly favor, or favor, denial. Institution of this IPR would result in duplicative effort, cause additional cost to litigate in two forums, and would be an inefficient use of the Board’s limited resources. Thus, the Director should exercise discretion to deny institution for at least this reason, as well as for the additional reasons set forth in Sandpiper’s DD Req.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Jason D. Eisenberg/

Jason Eisenberg, Reg. No. 43,447

Daniel Block, Reg. No. 68,395

Kristina Caggiano Kelly, Reg. No. 58,164

Xiaowei Jin, Reg. No. 81,041

Counsel for Patent Owner

Date: September 19, 2025

1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 371-2600

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e))

I certify that the above-captioned **PATENT OWNER'S REPLY BRIEF**
ON DISCRETIONARY DENIAL was served in its entirety on September 19,
2025, upon the following parties via electronic mail:

Erika H. Arner (Lead Counsel) erika.arner@finnegan.com
Daniel C. Tucker (Back-Up Counsel) daniel.tucker@finnegan.com
Kara A. Specht (Back-Up Counsel) kara.specht@finnegan.com
Cara E. Regan (Back-Up Counsel) cara.regan@finnegan.com
Sydney R. Kestle (Back-Up Counsel) sydney.kestle@finnegan.com
Anthony J. Berlenbach (Back-Up Counsel) anthony.berlenbach@finnegan.com
Google-Sandpiper-IPRs@finnegan.com
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC

/Jason D. Eisenberg/

Jason D. Eisenberg
Registration No. 43,447
Counsel for Patent Owner

Date: September 19, 2025

1101 K Street, NW, 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 371-2600