

From: [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
To: [Christopher, Angelo](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
Cc: [Burnham, Daniel](#); [Hayes, Jennifer](#); [Girgis, Diana](#); sporteln@millerjohnson.com; griffithb@millerjohnson.com; cowdreyj@millerjohnson.com
Subject: RE: IPR2025-01057, -01059, -01104 - Ascentcare Dental Products, Inc. v. Solmetex, LLC - Discretionary Denial Reply Brief Request
Date: Friday, October 17, 2025 1:12:26 PM

Patent Owner's requests are denied as moot.

From: Christopher, Angelo <achristopher@nixonpeabody.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 12:55 PM
To: Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>
Cc: Burnham, Daniel <dburnham@nixonpeabody.com>; Hayes, Jennifer <jenhayes@nixonpeabody.com>; Girgis, Diana <dgirgis@nixonpeabody.com>; sporteln@millerjohnson.com; griffithb@millerjohnson.com; cowdreyj@millerjohnson.com
Subject: RE: IPR2025-01057, -01059, -01104 - Ascentcare Dental Products, Inc. v. Solmetex, LLC - Discretionary Denial Reply Brief Request

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

Honorable Board,

As a follow-up to the email below, the parties have further conferred, and Petitioner has asked that we provide the Board the following position statement regarding its opposition:

Petitioner opposes because Petitioner's position is that the Board primarily allowed Patent Owner additional briefing in the IPR2025-01020 because Petitioner's Sotera stipulation was not filed before Patent Owner's discretionary denial brief was due and because the District Court ruled on the Stay after the discretionary denial brief was filed. Neither is the case in any of the identified proceedings.

Patent Owner's desire to comment on Petitioner's arguments alone is not good cause.

Respectfully submitted,

Angelo Christopher
Reg. No. 81,594
Counsel for Patent Owner



Angelo J. Christopher

Counsel

achristopher@nixonpeabody.com

T/ +1 312.977.4391 M/ +1 312.366.4745 F/ +1 844.450.2568

[Nixon Peabody LLP](#)

70 West Madison, Suite 5200, Chicago, IL 60602-4378

This email message and any attachments are confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client or other applicable privileges. The information is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s) of the message. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your email system. Unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Thank you.

From: Christopher, Angelo

Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 10:39 AM

To: 'Director_Discretionary_Decision@USPTO.gov' <Director_Discretionary_Decision@USPTO.gov>

Cc: Burnham, Daniel <dburnham@nixonpeabody.com>; Hayes, Jennifer

<jenhayes@nixonpeabody.com>; Girgis, Diana <dgirgis@nixonpeabody.com>;

sporteln@millerjohnson.com; griffithb@millerjohnson.com; cowdreyj@millerjohnson.com

Subject: IPR2025-01057, -01059, -01104 - Ascentcare Dental Products, Inc. v. Solmetex, LLC - Discretionary Denial Reply Brief Request

Honorable Board,

Patent Owner respectfully requests authorization to file reply briefs addressing the discretionary denial issues in IPR2025-01057, IPR2025-01059, and IPR2025-01104. If authorized, Patent Owner would file these briefs within 2 business days, i.e., by October 6.

For IPR2025-01057 and IPR2025-01059, Patent Owner requests a 4-page reply brief limited to § 325(d) issues. Good cause exists because the opposition mischaracterizes Patent Owner's arguments regarding cumulativeness and the prosecution history. Patent Owner notes that the Board authorized a reply in related IPR2025-01020 on these issues.

For IPR2025-01104, Patent Owner requests a 5-page reply brief. Good cause exists for the same reasons as the other IPRs and because Petitioner's opposition accuses Patent Owner of making "misrepresentations" to the Office during prosecution. Paper 8 at 10. Patent Owner submits that good cause exists for a reply to explain why this accusation, which was not in the Petition, is incorrect.

Petitioner has indicated that it opposes these requests.

Respectfully submitted,

Angelo Christopher

Reg. No. 81,594

Counsel for Patent Owner



Angelo J. Christopher

Counsel

achristopher@nixonpeabody.com

T/ +1 312.977.4391 M/ +1 312.366.4745 F/ +1 844.450.2568

[Nixon Peabody LLP](#)

70 West Madison, Suite 5200, Chicago, IL 60602-4378

This email message and any attachments are confidential and may be protected by the attorney/client or other applicable privileges. The information is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s) of the message. If you are not an intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately and delete the message from your email system. Unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message by other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Thank you.