

From: [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
To: [Lindner, David](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
Cc: [andy.ehmke.ipr@haynesboone.com](#); [david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com](#); [david.odell.ipr@haynesboone.com](#); [Gregory Huh IPR](#); [BEFerguson@winston.com](#); [CCLiu@winston.com](#); [jkappos@winston.com](#); [Gurka, Jon](#); [Rey Barcelo](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2025-00913, -00914, -00915, and -00916: Intel/Advanced Micro Devices v. Advanced Cluster Systems - PO Request for Authorization to File Reply Briefs in Support of Discretionary Denial
Date: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 11:54:28 AM

Patent Owner is authorized to file a 5-page reply in IPR2025-00913, -00914, -00195, and -00916, due no later than Thursday, September 4, 2025, limited to addressing the arguments raised below. Petitioner is authorized to file a 5-page sur-reply, due no later than Monday, September 8, 2025.

From: Lindner, David <DLindner@crowell.com>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 4:35 PM
To: Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>
Cc: andy.ehmke.ipr@haynesboone.com; david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com; david.odell.ipr@haynesboone.com; Gregory Huh IPR <gregory.huh.ipr@haynesboone.com>; BEFerguson@winston.com; CCLiu@winston.com; jkappos@winston.com; Gurka, Jon <JGurka@crowell.com>; Rey Barcelo <rey@bhiplaw.com>
Subject: IPR2025-00913, -00914, -00915, and -00916: Intel/Advanced Micro Devices v. Advanced Cluster Systems - PO Request for Authorization to File Reply Briefs in Support of Discretionary Denial

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 Acting Director and the Honorable Board,

Pursuant to FAQ #16 of the USPTO's Interim Processes for PTAB Workload Management (<https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/faqs/interim-processes-workload-management>) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.23(b), Patent Owner, Advanced Cluster Systems, Inc., respectfully requests authorization to file a short reply brief in each of IPR2025-00913, -00914, -00915, and -00916 in response to Petitioners' August 27, 2025 oppositions to Patent Owner's discretionary denial submissions (IPR2025-00913, Paper 9; IPR2025-00914, Paper 9; IPR2025-00915, Paper 8; and IPR2025-00916, Paper 8).

Good cause exists because several sections of Petitioners' opposition briefs raise new arguments to which Patent Owner should be entitled to respond. These include:

- **Section II.B**, which asserts new arguments that the Office erred in manner material to patentability;
- **Section II.C**, which asserts new arguments directed to 35 U.S.C. § 325(d);
- **Section II.D**, which asserts new arguments directed Patent Owner seeking an injunction;

- **Section II.E**, which asserts new arguments directed to Petitioners' economic activity and the impact of jobs that would be imperiled by Patent Owner's allegations;
- **Section II.F.2**, which asserts new arguments directed to the timing of a final written decision (*Fintiv* factor 2); and
- **Section II.F.3**, which misrepresents *Fintiv* factor 3 and the activity that has been invested in the parallel litigation.

These sections go beyond the scope of the Petition and raise new affirmative arguments for the first time in opposition, depriving Patent Owner of any opportunity to address them. The only fair and orderly path forward is to authorize Patent Owner a targeted reply in each proceeding. Anything less would frustrate the purpose of the process and contradict the basic procedural safeguards embodied in 37 C.F.R. § 42.23 and principles of due process.

Patent Owner respectfully requests authorization to file a reply brief of up to 8 pages in each of IPR2025-00913, IPR2025-00914, IPR2025-00915, and IPR2025-00916, limited to responding to the new arguments presented in Sections II.B, II.C, II.D, II.E, II.F.2, and II.F.3. of Petitioners' August 27 opposition briefs.

Counsel for the parties have conferred, and Petitioners have provided the below position. With respect to Petitioners' position, Patent Owner defers to the Acting Director and the Board and takes no position with respect to Petitioners' request.

Respectfully,
-David Lindner
Counsel for Advanced Cluster Systems, Inc.

Petitioners' Position:

Patent Owner could have reasonably foreseen that Petitioner would raise the issues Patent Owner identifies and Patent Owner should have addressed these issues in its opening briefs. Accordingly, no further briefing is needed in these proceedings. However, if Patent Owner is granted leave to file a reply, then Petitioner respectfully requests that it be granted an opportunity to file equal length sur-reply briefs in each identified proceeding.

David P. Lindner
dlindner@crowell.com
+1.312.222.8123 direct

Crowell & Moring LLP
455 North Cityfront Plaza Drive
Suite 3600
Chicago, IL 60611

Crowell

Collaboration Powers Success

crowell.com

This message may contain privileged and confidential information. IF IT WAS SENT TO YOU BY MISTAKE, DO NOT READ IT. Instead, please notify the sender (or postmaster@crowell.com) by reply e-mail, and delete this e-mail. Unauthorized dissemination, forwarding or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.