

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ASUSTEK COMPUTER INC.
Petitioner,

v.

NOKIA TECHNOLOGIES OY
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2025-01153
Patent 10,536,714

PETITIONER'S BRIEF PURSUANT TO PAPER 27

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Statement of Facts.....	2
	A. The <i>Inter Partes</i> Review, the Stipulation, and Institution.....	2
	B. The Parallel ITC Investigation and the Separate Co-Respondents	3
	C. ASUS’s Consistent, On-the-Record Abstention From the ’714 Patent Invalidity Case	4
	D. The Post-Hearing Brief and Nokia’s Untimely Request	5
III.	Argument	7
	A. ASUS Did Not Violate Its Stipulation.....	7
	i) ASUS did not pursue the ’714 invalidity grounds; Acer did, and ASUS abstained on the record at every step.	8
	ii) The consolidated Post-Hearing Brief does not show that ASUS “pursued” the grounds, and the Rules made that impossible.....	8
	B. The Director’s Question Is Whether ASUS Violated Its Stipulation, Not Whether the Overlap Warrants Discretionary Denial, a Question Resolved at Institution.	9
	C. Even If Acer’s Invalidity Case Was Attributed to ASUS, the Instituted Review Should Proceed Because the Board’s Resources Remain Justified.....	11
	D. The Office Should Correct Its Own Errors Rather Than Defer to the ITC. 13	
IV.	Conclusion	15

EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
ASUS-1001	U.S. Patent No. 10,536,714 to Bici, et al. (“the ’714 patent”)
ASUS-1002	Prosecution File History for the ’714 patent (“Prosecution History”)
ASUS-1003	Declaration of Joseph Havlicek (“Havlicek Declaration”)
ASUS-1004	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2011/0194609 to Rusert et al (“Rusert”)
ASUS-1005	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2011/0249721 to Karczewicz et al (“Karczewicz”)
ASUS-1006	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2014/0092981 to Lin et al (“Lin”)
ASUS-1007	Nakamura et al., “Unification of derivation process for merge mode and MVP,” Joint Collaborative Team on Video Coding (JCT-VC) of ITU-T SG16 WP3 and ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11, 6th Meeting, Torino, Italy, Jul. 14-22, 2011, Document JCTVC-F419 (“Nakamura Document”)
ASUS-1008-1011	[RESERVED]
ASUS-1012	U.S. Provisional Application 61/301,649 (“Rusert Provisional”)
ASUS-1013	U.S. Provisional Application 61/500,903 (“Lin Provisional”)
ASUS-1014	[RESERVED]
ASUS-1015	Prosecution File History for U.S. Patent No. 9,571,833 (“’833 Prosecution History”)
ASUS-1016	[RESERVED]
ASUS-1017	European Prosecution File History for 12845839 (“European Prosecution History”)
ASUS-1018	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2012/0128067 to Liu (“Liu”)
ASUS-1019	Gary J. Sullivan, Recent Developments in Standardization of High Efficiency Video Coding (HEVC) (“Sullivan”)
ASUS-1020	Frank Bossen, HEVC Complexity and Implementation Analysis (“Bossen”)

Exhibit No.	Description
ASUS-1021	Jian-Wei Chen et al, Introduction to H.264 advanced video coding. In: Proceedings of the 2006 Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference vol. 2006, pp. 736–741 (2006)
ASUS-1022	Won, Kwanghyun et al, Motion vector coding using decoder-side estimation of motion vector. In 2009 IEEE International Symposium on Broadband Multimedia Systems and Broadcasting (BMSB). IEEE, 2009
ASUS-1023	Gary J. Sullivan et al, The H.264/AVC Advanced Video Coding Standard: Overview and Introduction to the Fidelity Range Extensions, SPIE Conference on Applications of Digital Image Processing XXVII, 2004
ASUS-1024-1051	[RESERVED]
ASUS-1052	Institution Decision IPR2024-00604, Paper 11, November 7, 2024
ASUS-1053	Institution Decision IPR2024-00605, Paper 11, November 7, 2024
ASUS-1054	August 1, 2025 ASUS Stipulation
ASUS-1055	U.S. Patent No. 9,571,833 to Bici, et al. (“the ’833 patent”)
ASUS-1056	Office Action of August 16, 2021 in U.S. Application No. 16/741,156
ASUS-1057	Amendment of February 16, 2022 in U.S. Application No. 16/741,156
ASUS-1058	Declaration of Kyle J. Fleming in support of Pro Hac Vice motion
ASUS-1059	Hearing Transcript in Investigation No. 337-TA-1448
ASUS-1060	ITC Order No. 26 in Investigation No. 337-TA-1448
ASUS-1061	Email exchange between counsel in IPR2025-01153
ASUS-1062	Email exchange between counsel in Investigation No. 337-TA-1448
ASUS-1063	Respondents’ Pre-Hearing Brief in Investigation No. 337-TA-1448
ASUS-1064	Acer’s Demonstrative in Investigation No. 337-TA-1448

Exhibit No.	Description
ASUS-1065	Notice of Ground Rules in Investigation No. 337-TA-1448
ASUS-1066	Complainants' Reply Post-Hearing Brief in Investigation No. 337-TA-1448

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioners (“ASUS”) submit this brief pursuant to the Director’s Order (Paper 27). To address Patent Owner’s (“Nokia”) request for discretionary denial, ASUS promised that *it* would not pursue certain prior art grounds against U.S. Patent No. 10,536,714 (the “’714 patent”) in the co-pending litigation between the parties. ASUS honored that promise at every step. The parties that pursued invalidity against the ’714 patent in the parallel ITC investigation were Acer Inc. and Acer America Corporation (collectively, “Acer”)—separate, unrelated respondents that ASUS does not control and that the stipulation does not bind.

The Director initiated review into the issue of whether ASUS has honored its stipulation. It emphatically has, at all times. From institution forward, ASUS confirmed its non-pursuit of the foregone invalidity grounds in writing, both to Nokia’s IPR counsel and, separately, to Nokia’s ITC counsel with the Commission Staff copied. ASUS explicitly carved the ’714 invalidity grounds out of its Pre-Hearing Brief as being “advanced solely by Respondent Acer and not by ASUS.” ASUS’s counsel told the ITC in open court that invalidity against the ’714 patent would be presented “entirely on behalf of Acer.” And ASUS’s counsel stood aside during the hearing while Acer’s counsel examined Acer’s expert and cross-examined Nokia’s expert on the ’714 patent invalidity issues—an invalidity case that Nokia’s own validity expert, and own briefing, called “Acer’s.”

The Director cites in Paper 27 a consolidated Post-Hearing Brief that did not (and did not need to) repeat the same carve-out regarding the '714 invalidity grounds stated explicitly in the Respondents' Pre-Hearing Brief. Both the Commission's Rules and the Administrative Law Judge's Ground Rules deem abandoned any contentions not made in a party's Pre-Hearing Brief, so ASUS could not have advanced an invalidity defense against the '714 patent in its Post-Hearing Brief even if it had wished to. A joint brief (which is customary and expected among Respondents who are required by the Administrative Law Judge's Ground Rules to coordinate their discovery efforts) did not, and as a matter of Commission procedure could not, convert Acer's case into ASUS's.

ASUS has scrupulously kept to the terms of its stipulation. The discretionary balance also favors review, particularly in light of the advanced stage of the proceeding and Nokia's unwarranted months of delay. The factual record compels a finding that ASUS did not violate its stipulation, and the Director should lift the stay and allow the instituted review to proceed.

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. The *Inter Partes* Review, the Stipulation, and Institution

ASUS petitioned for *inter partes* review of the '714 patent, challenging the claims as obvious over Rusert in combination with Karczewicz. Pet. 9. To address Nokia's request for discretionary denial, ASUS filed a stipulation, dated August 1,

2025, providing that “ASUS will not pursue in the co-pending litigation the specific grounds” raised in the Petition “or any other ground that could have been reasonably raised,” that is, any § 102 or § 103 ground based on patents or printed publications. Ex. 1054, 1. The stipulation defined the “co-pending litigation” as the two matters Nokia had brought against ASUS: the parallel proceeding before the U.S. International Trade Commission and a co-pending action in the Central District of California. *Id.* The Director instituted review on December 11, 2025, determining that “no other non-discretionary considerations warrant denial.” Paper 14, 2. A final written decision is due December 11, 2026.

B. The Parallel ITC Investigation and the Separate Co-Respondents

Nokia asserted the ’714 patent against ASUS in Inv. No. 337-TA-1448 (the “Investigation”), instituted May 19, 2025. ASUS is not the only respondent. Nokia also named Acer Inc. and Acer America Corporation—separate, unrelated entities, separately sued and separately represented by different counsel (ASUS by Fish & Richardson P.C.; Acer by Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP). Ex. 1059 (Hr’g Tr.) 4–7. Acer did not join this IPR proceeding, is not a real party in interest, and is not controlled by ASUS. Pet. 91. As explained, *infra*, upon institution of the ’714 IPR petition in December 2025, ASUS made clear to all parties and the Commission that it was not pursuing invalidity defenses against the ’714 patent at the ITC. An evidentiary hearing was held from March 4–12, 2026.

Following a lapse in appropriations that closed the Commission in late 2025, the presiding ALJ extended the schedule: the Final Initial Determination is now due August 14, 2026, and the Target Date for the Commission's final determination is December 14, 2026. Ex. 1060 (ITC Order No. 26) (Dec. 2, 2025).

C. ASUS's Consistent, On-the-Record Abstention From the '714 Patent Invalidity Case

From institution forward, ASUS stated, repeatedly, that it was not pursuing the '714 patent invalidity grounds and that Acer alone advanced them.

In January 2026, when Nokia's counsel asked ASUS to confirm its compliance with its *Sotera* stipulation, ASUS responded that, "[c]onsistent with the stipulation," it was "no longer pursuing in the co-pending litigation the specific grounds asserted in [the IPR], or any other ground that could have been reasonably raised," and that it would "make this clear in its Prehearing Brief." Ex. 1061 (Jan. 27, 2026 Email). ASUS invited Nokia to direct any concern about the ITC prior-art grounds to ASUS's ITC counsel. *Id.* Nokia replied, "Thanks," and did not pursue the matter further. *Id.* Days later, ASUS's ITC counsel confirmed to Nokia's ITC counsel, copying the Commission Investigative Staff attorney, that "ASUS *is honoring the stipulation* it entered into, as reflected in Respondents' Prehearing Brief which stated that ASUS is not pursuing the prior art-based invalidity grounds for the '714 patent." Ex. 1062 (Feb. 2, 2026 Email).

ASUS made the same point of record in the Investigation. Its Pre-Hearing Brief stated that “the § 103 invalidity grounds asserted herein against the ’714 patent are advanced solely by Respondent Acer and not by ASUS.” Ex. 1063 (Resp. Pre-Hr’g Br.) 91 n.2. At the hearing, ASUS’s counsel told the Administrative Law Judge on the public record that “Acer, not ASUS . . . will be advancing invalidity arguments based on prior art for this patent,” that ASUS “stipulated not to advance invalidity defenses in this investigation,” and that “this defense will be entirely on behalf of Acer, just to be clear.” Ex. 1059 (Hr’g Tr.) 89:24–90:6. The conduct matched: Acer’s counsel, not ASUS’s, conducted the direct examination of Acer’s invalidity expert, Dr. Hemami, on the ’714 patent, an arrangement noticed to Nokia without objection. Ex. 1059 (Hr’g Tr.) 997:21–998:4. Nokia’s own validity expert, Dr. Richardson, likewise described the relevant ground as “Acer’s invalidity ground.” Ex. 1059 (Hr’g Tr.) 1933:7–12, and the demonstrative used to present the case was captioned “’714 Patent – Acer’s Invalidity Case.” Ex. 1064 (RDX-0001C.30) (excerpt below).

’714 Patent – Acer’s Invalidity Case

D. The Post-Hearing Brief and Nokia’s Untimely Request

On April 16, 2026, Respondents filed a single, consolidated Post-Hearing Brief that does not repeat the Pre-Hearing Brief’s statement that the grounds were

Acer's alone. It did not need to: ASUS had already withdrawn those grounds by omitting them from its Pre-Hearing Brief. Ex. 1065 (ALJ Ground Rules) 7.2 ("Any contentions and theories of the case not set forth in detail [in a party's Pre-Hearing Brief] shall be deemed abandoned or withdrawn.").¹

In its Reply Post-Hearing Brief in the Investigation, Nokia presented a demonstrative captioned "Acer Confuses the Set of Spatial Motion Vector Prediction Candidates with the Subset . . . ," attributing the invalidity argument to Acer only. Ex. 1066 (Nokia Reply Post-Hr'g Br.) 37 (showing CDX-11.71).

Nokia did not seek review of the institution decision within the time allowed. Instead, on May 8, 2026, roughly four and a half months after the December 29, 2025 deadline, and over a month after post-hearing briefs were filed, Nokia filed a request for Director Review seeking to vacate institution. Paper 26. That request was dismissed as untimely, and Nokia's request to waive the deadline was denied. Ex. 3102. On May 27, 2026, the Director initiated *sua sponte* review, stayed the proceeding, and directed the parties to brief whether ASUS violated its stipulation and, if so, the appropriate remedy. Paper 27, 2–3.

¹ Similarly, 19 CFR § 207.24 limits a party's "presentation at the hearing to a summary of the information and arguments contained in its prehearing brief."

III. ARGUMENT

ASUS did not violate its stipulation. The stipulation reflects ASUS's promise *for ASUS* not to pursue the '714 prior-art grounds in the co-pending litigation, and ASUS honored it at every turn; the party that pursued those grounds was Acer, a separate respondent the stipulation does not bind and ASUS does not control. The single Post-Hearing Brief the Director cites does not change that: the Rules made it impossible for ASUS to advance the defense after ASUS withdrew it prior to the hearing. And regardless, even if Acer's invalidity case were considered a violation of ASUS's stipulation (it is not), the instituted review should proceed because the Board's resources remain as justified now as they were at institution.

A. ASUS Did Not Violate Its Stipulation.

Whether ASUS honored its stipulation turns on what it promised and what it did. ASUS promised that it—and it alone—would not pursue the '714 prior-art grounds in the co-pending litigation, and it kept that promise. Acer, a separate party the stipulation does not bind and that ASUS cannot control, pursued the grounds instead. Nothing in the record shows ASUS pursuing those grounds after institution, and the Rules made it impossible for ASUS to have done so once it carved them out of its Pre-Hearing Brief.

i) ASUS did not pursue the '714 invalidity grounds; Acer did, and ASUS abstained on the record at every step.

The record leaves no doubt that Acer, not ASUS, pursued the '714 invalidity grounds. ASUS confirmed its non-pursuit in writing, carved those grounds out of its Pre-Hearing Brief, and told the Administrative Law Judge that the defense would be presented “entirely on behalf of Acer.” *See supra* § II.C; Ex. 1063 (Resp. Pre-Hr’g Br.) 91 n.2; Ex. 1059 (Hr’g Tr.) 89:24–90:6. At the hearing, only Acer’s counsel examined the experts on the '714 invalidity issues. *Id.*, 997:21–998:4.

Nokia itself treated the '714 invalidity case as Acer’s throughout: its own validity expert called the relevant combination “Acer’s invalidity ground,” Ex. 1059 (Hr’g Tr.) 1933:7–12, and its reply brief is built around a demonstrative captioned “Acer Confuses the Set” Ex. 1066 (Nokia Reply Post-Hr’g Br.) 37. A party does not “pursue” a defense that its adversary, that adversary’s expert, and the hearing record all attribute to someone else.

That allocation was no formality. The '714 grounds were litigated only because Acer put them in play; ASUS’s promise not to pursue them did not require ASUS to stop Acer from mounting its own defense in the manner of its choosing.

ii) The consolidated Post-Hearing Brief does not show that ASUS “pursued” the grounds, and the Rules made that impossible.

As noted, Respondents’ joint Post-Hearing Brief does not repeat Respondents’ Pre-Hearing Brief’s statement that the '714 patent invalidity grounds

were Acer's alone. Ex. 3103, 31–52. But restating the carve-out was unnecessary and its omission cannot bear the weight Nokia places on it, for two reasons.

First, and dispositively, the Rules make it impossible for ASUS to advance the '714 grounds after it did not raise them in its Pre-Hearing Brief. *See supra* § II.D. Having stated in its Pre-Hearing Brief that the '714 invalidity grounds were “advanced solely by Respondent Acer and not by ASUS,” Ex. 1063 (Resp. Pre-Hr'g Br.) 91 n.2, ASUS preserved no '714 invalidity contention of its own and was barred from advancing one thereafter. The Commission enforces that rule: a contention omitted from the pre-hearing brief is abandoned and cannot be raised for the first time afterward. *Certain Automated Media Library Devices*, Inv. No. 337-TA-746, Comm'n Op. at 14–16 (USITC 2013). A collective Post-Hearing Brief thus could not have done what the Rules forbade: it could not, and did not, convert Acer's preserved invalidity case into ASUS's.

Second, the substance of the '714 patent invalidity arguments in Respondents' Post-Hearing Brief is the same Ruser/Karczewicz case Acer advanced through Dr. Hemami: the same expert, the same references, the same demonstratives. Those pages reflect Acer's case, set out in a consolidated brief; they reflect no advocacy by ASUS. ASUS withdrew and abandoned the grounds.

B. The Director's Question Is Whether ASUS Violated Its Stipulation, Not Whether the Overlap Warrants Discretionary Denial, a Question Resolved at Institution.

The Director ordered the parties to address whether ASUS “violated” its stipulation. Paper 27, 2. That is a question about ASUS’s conduct measured against its promise—the question answered above in Section A. Nokia’s Request for Director Review, however, presses a different inquiry. It argues that “[w]hat matters is the substance of the duplication, not the formal identity of the advocate.” Paper 26, 9. That is a *Fintiv* argument about overlap between the two proceedings, not an argument that ASUS broke its promise. The two inquiries are distinct. Whether ASUS *violated its stipulation* asks something else entirely: did ASUS do what it promised not to do? Overlap does not answer that question; conduct does. And ASUS’s conduct, as shown above, was scrupulous abstention.

To the extent Nokia offers the overlap not as proof of breach but as a reason to undo institution, that argument was rejected months ago. Nokia raised potential overlap in its discretionary-denial briefing, Paper 10, 8-12, and the Office instituted anyway, determining that “no other non-discretionary considerations warrant denial,” Paper 14, 2.

Office guidance confirms the weight of that determination: “[a]bsent extraordinary circumstances, the Board will not revisit a decision on institution if the time for seeking Director Review or rehearing has passed.” Mar. 24, 2025 Mem. 1. Relabeling a rejected *Fintiv* overlap argument as a stipulation “violation” does not transform a discretionary question already resolved into a live one.

C. Even If Acer's Invalidity Case Was Attributed to ASUS, the Instituted Review Should Proceed Because the Board's Resources Remain Justified.

ASUS did not violate its stipulation, and the inquiry should end there. But even if the Director were to conclude otherwise, vacating institution should not follow: the Board's resources are as justified now as they were at institution.

First, the discretionary balance has strengthened: the timing factor on which Nokia's overlap theory depends now favors review. Office guidance measures the comparison against the ITC's "full Commission's final determination" and instructs that the Director is "less likely to deny institution . . . where the ITC['s] projected final determination date is after the Board's deadline to issue a final written decision." Mar. 24, 2025 Mem. 2. Here, the Commission's final determination is set for December 14, 2026, after the December 11, 2026 deadline for the final written decision. Ex. 1060 (ITC Order No. 26); Paper 14, 2. The merits, too, have been confirmed rather than called into doubt: the Director instituted after full consideration of the petition. Paper 14. Undoing an instituted, merits-tested review would disserve the efficiency and patent-quality interests of the public that the discretionary framework exists to protect.

Second, Nokia's delay, and the resulting prejudice to ASUS, foreclose so drastic a step. When Nokia asked ASUS in January 2026 to confirm compliance, it said it would seek Board relief only "if ASUS does not answer or otherwise does

not follow through.” Ex. 1061 (Jan. 27, 2026 Email). ASUS answered, in writing and on the record; Nokia replied “Thanks” and let the matter rest. *Id.* Shortly thereafter, ASUS again confirmed to Nokia’s ITC counsel, copying the Commission Investigative Staff attorney, that it is honoring its stipulation. Ex. 1062 (Feb. 2, 2026 Email). Nokia then waited roughly four and a half months, through the hearing and all post-hearing briefing, before seeking review, untimely, in May 2026. Paper 26. Its conduct in that very window confirms it understood the defense to be Acer’s: ten days after telling the Director that ASUS pursued these grounds, Nokia filed an ITC brief attributing the argument to Acer. Ex. 1066 (Nokia Reply Post-Hr’g Br.) 37.

Nokia’s delay is of its own making. Nokia argued in its discretionary denial briefing that ASUS’s stipulation was ineffective, and the Director rejected that argument in granting institution. Paper 14, 2. Nokia could have pressed any compliance concern at numerous earlier junctures in the Investigation, whether in the pre-hearing brief, at the evidentiary hearing, or in post-hearing briefing, yet it raised none until after validity at the ITC had closed. Patent owners must raise discretionary concerns in a timely manner, and rewarding Nokia’s delay would produce the perverse result of leaving ASUS unable to advance an invalidity case in any forum. ASUS relied on Nokia’s silence, apparent acceptance of ASUS’s

explanation, and the Director's decision to institute despite the existence of co-respondents unbound by the stipulation.

The prejudice is concrete. To honor its stipulation, ASUS neither joined the Pre-Hearing Brief on '714 invalidity nor examined any witness on that issue at the hearing; it chose to advance its challenge before the PTAB, dropping its invalidity defense at the ITC. Vacating the instituted review would strip ASUS of the IPR as well, leaving it unable to test validity of the '714 patent in any forum. A party that kept its promise, and relied on it, should not end up worse off than one that never promised at all.

D. The Office Should Correct Its Own Errors Rather Than Defer to the ITC.

Maintaining the instituted review also serves the Office's interest in correcting its own examination errors. ASUS petitioned for review of three Nokia patents in this dispute (IPR2025-01153, IPR2025-01154, IPR2025-01279), and the Director exercised discretion to decline to institute on each except this one. Paper 13. The dispositive difference here was examiner error:² the Ruser-based grounds on which this petition was instituted were overlooked during original examination

² Examiner error is the only unique factor as it relates to the evaluation of discretion between IPR2025-01153 and IPR2025-01154.

of the '714 patent, even though the Office has since viewed those same grounds favorably more than once. *See* Paper 11, 8-14. The Examiner endorsed Rusert in a later continuation application, *see* ASUS-1056, and the Office has twice found the Rusert-based grounds to present a reasonable likelihood of success against the '714 patent—first by the Board in instituting Amazon’s petitions for IPR, IPR2024-00604, Paper 11 (Nov. 7, 2024), IPR2024-00605, Paper 11 (Nov. 7, 2024), and again by the Director in instituting this proceeding, Paper 14. As discussed in Petitioner’s Opposition to Patent Owner’s Request for Discretionary Denial, the Examiner had improperly relied on examination of a parent patent and overlooked Rusert, which was later used to reject similar claims in a child application. *See* Paper 11, 8–14. The Office has now assessed the Rusert grounds favorably **three** times, and the public deserves the Office’s final view on the patentability of the '714 patent claims over Rusert. *Magnolia Medical Technologies, Inc. v. Kurin, Inc.*, IPR2026-00097, Paper 17, 8 (May 14, 2026) (precedential)(“examiner error can overcome other factors that suggest discretionary denial.”).

The ITC is not an adequate substitute for that determination. The Commission is not the Office; it adjudicates importation under Section 337 and cannot cancel or invalidate patent claims. The most efficient way to secure a definitive patentability ruling is to maintain institution and resolve the Rusert grounds in a final written decision. The USPTO alone can correct its own

examination errors, and it should not leave that task to a tribunal that lacks the power to perform it. *Magnolia Medical Technologies*, IPR2026-00097, Paper 17, 6 (“the central purpose of IPRs is to determine whether the patent at issue may have been improvidently granted and whether and to what extent that right should continue to be recognized at all.”).

At bottom, examiner error was sufficient to avoid discretionary denial at the time of institution, despite the fast schedule of the ITC where co-respondents have always been present. Nothing has changed. An about face now on the same facts would severely prejudice ASUS, who kept its stipulation promise, did not pursue invalidity challenges at the ITC, and would be left without the right to challenge the '714 patent in its co-pending litigation if institution is vacated. *Cf. Magnolia Medical Technologies*, IPR2026-00097, Paper 17, 6 (“private litigants retain the right to challenge a patent on any ground in district court and lose no substantive rights when an AIA review is denied institution”). And it would harm the public—regardless of the outcome in the co-pending ITC litigation, Nokia would retain rights in claims that the Office has recognized were issued in error with multiple findings of a reasonable likelihood that those claims are obvious over Rusert.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Director should find no violation and allow the instituted review to proceed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: June 2, 2026

/Jeremy J. Monaldo/

Jeremy J. Monaldo, Reg. No. 58,680

Kim Leung, Reg. No. 64,399

Joseph V. Colaianni, Reg. No. 39,948

Linhong Zhang, Reg. No. 64,749

Jack R. Wilson IV, Reg. No. 75,011

Kyle J. Fleming, (*Pro Hac Vice*)

Fish & Richardson P.C.

60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200

Minneapolis, MN 55402

T: 202-783-5070

F: 877-769-7945

Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATION OF PAGE-COUNT COMPLIANCE

Under the provisions of 37 CFR § 42.24(d), the undersigned hereby certifies that the page count for the foregoing Petitioner's Brief Pursuant To Paper 27 totals 15 pages, as authorized by Paper 27, issued May 27, 2026.

Dated: June 2, 2026

/Jeremy J. Monaldo/

Jeremy J. Monaldo, Reg. No. 58,680
Kim Leung, Reg. No. 64,399
Joseph V. Colaianni, Reg. No. 39,948
Linhong Zhang, Reg. No. 64,749
Jack R. Wilson IV, Reg. No. 75,011
Kyle J. Fleming, (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
T: 202-783-5070
F: 877-769-7945

Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 42.6(e)(4), the undersigned certifies that on June 2, 2026, a complete and entire copy of this Petitioner's Brief Pursuant To Paper 27 and Accompanying Exhibits were provided by email to the Patent Owner by serving the email correspondence address of record as follows:

Scott W. Hejny
Eric S. Hansen
Joseph W. Micheli
R. Mitch Verboncoeur, Admitted *pro hac vice*
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75201

Email: Nokia-AsusIPR@mckoolsmith.com

/Anastasia Renard/
Anastasia Renard
Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
renard@fr.com