

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AESTHETIC MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, LLC and
AESTHETIC MANAGEMENT PARTNERS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

HYDRAFACIAL LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-01169 (Patent 9,550,052 B2)
IPR2025-01217 (Patent 11,446,477 B2)¹

Before JOHN A. SQUIRES, *Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual
Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

ORDER

¹ This Order applies to each of the listed cases.

IPR2025-01169 (Patent 9,550,052 B2)
IPR2025-01217 (Patent 11,446,477 B2)

On January 16, 2026, I issued a Notice granting institution of the above-referenced *inter partes* reviews (“IPRs”), but stayed them in view of the pending Director Review of the institution decision in IPR2025-00145 (“145 IPR”). Paper 17 (“Notice”), 3.² On February 12, 2026, I vacated the Board’s Decision granting institution of the 145 IPR because the U.S. International Trade Commission (“ITC”) already had found that the claims of the same challenged patent were not invalid based on the same prior art asserted in the 145 IPR. 145 IPR, Paper 41, Paper 46 (denying Request for Rehearing).

On May 1, 2026, I issued an order initiating *sua sponte* Director Review to consider whether these IPRs also should be de-instituted and terminated in view of the ITC’s findings on closely related claims. Paper 18, 2 (citing Ex. 2161, 99–184).

On July 23, 2026, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issued an Order granting a motion to dismiss the appeals of the ITC’s decision as moot and to vacate the ITC’s Final Determination because the patent challenged in the 145 IPR had expired. *Cartessa Aesthetics, LLC v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, Nos. 2026-1582, 2026-1881, 2026 WL 2123050, at *1 (Fed. Cir. July 23, 2026) (finding that in section 337 cases an appeal generally is moot once the asserted patent has expired and that “[i]n such situations, where mootness is due entirely to happenstance . . . we have routinely vacated the [ITC’s] underlying final determination”). In view of the court’s vacatur of the ITC’s decision, the Director Review is concluded.

² All citations are to IPR2025-01169. The Notice was also filed in IPR2025-01217.

IPR2025-01169 (Patent 9,550,052 B2)
IPR2025-01217 (Patent 11,446,477 B2)

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the *sua sponte* Director Review of the Notice granting institution of *inter partes* review is hereby concluded;

FURTHER ORDERED that the stay of the proceedings is lifted; and

FURTHER ORDERED the IPRs are returned to the Board for further proceedings.

IPR2025-01169 (Patent 9,550,052 B2)
IPR2025-01217 (Patent 11,446,477 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Scott A. McKeown
Michael N. Rader
George T. Scott
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
smckeown-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com
mrader-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com
gscott-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Ali S. Razai
Benjamin J. Everton
Benjamin B. Anger
Alexander B. Stein
Jacob L. Peterson
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
ali.razai@morganlewis.com
ben.everton@morganlewis.com
ben.anger@morganlewis.com
alexander.stein@morganlewis.com
jacob.peterson@morganlewis.com