

From: [Trials](#)
To: [Thomas Finch](#); [Trials](#)
Cc: [Joe Staley](#); [Scott Amy](#); [Champion Power Litigation](#); [Tim Ziolkowski](#); [Jacob Fritz](#); [Michael Carton](#); [rlt@zpatents.com](#); [GeneracIPR](#); [Taylor R. Stemler](#)
Subject: RE: Scheduling Order in IPR2025-01271; IPR2025-01457
Date: Tuesday, April 14, 2026 10:46:57 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Counsel –

As explained in Section B of the Scheduling Orders in these proceedings, the parties in these proceedings are free to *jointly stipulate* to different dates for certain Due Dates. Absent such an agreement, however, the panel will not force a change for general reasons such as efficiency, which appears to benefit one party. With that, Patent Owner's requests to extend certain Due Dates in IPR2025-01271 is *denied*.

The panel does, however, see a mutual benefit to aligning the hearing dates for these proceedings on December 15. In due course, an order will issue in IPR2025-01271 to change the hearing date to December 15.

Regards,

Andrew Kellogg,
Deputy Chief Clerk, Trials
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
USPTO
andrew.kellogg@uspto.gov
(571) 272-5366



From: Thomas Finch <t.finch@pkhip.com>
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 4:50 PM
To: Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: Joe Staley <j.staley@pkhip.com>; Scott Amy <s.amy@pkhip.com>; Champion Power Litigation <championlit@pkhip.com>; Tim Ziolkowski <tjz@zpatents.com>; Jacob Fritz <jmf@zpatents.com>; Michael Carton <mc@zpatents.com>; rlt@zpatents.com; GeneracIPR <GeneracIPR@merchantgould.com>; Taylor R. Stemler <tstemler@merchantgould.com>
Subject: Scheduling Order in IPR2025-01271; IPR2025-01457

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

Dear Board:

Patent Owner in both IPR2025-01271 and IPR2025-01457 respectively requests that the Board align all briefing deadlines in both proceeding, as well as consolidate the respective hearings. The Challenged Patents in each proceeding are related, and there is significant overlap in claim language. Similarly, Petitioner's challenges in each proceeding are based on substantially the same prior art. Consolidating the proceedings would increase the efficiency for both parties and the Board.

Alternatively, if the Board determines it does not wish to consolidate the hearing dates for these proceedings, Patent Owner respectfully requests a two-week extension to the following deadlines in IPR2025-01271. Petitioner's proposed extension does not impact any of Due Dates 5-9, and the proposed deadline for Patent Owner's response is still earlier than the three-month deadline suggested by 37 C.F.R. § 42.120(b).

	Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
Patent Owner's Response	May 26, 2026	June 9, 2026
Petitioner's Reply	August 18, 2026	September 1, 2026
Patent Owner's Sur-Reply	September 29, 2026	October 13, 2026

Petitioner has indicated that it opposes both requests. Petitioner's position is that it is common for IPR proceedings to be sequentially filed (and have deadlines that are sequentially staggered) in a manner that reflects the sequential filing of the patent applications to which they relate. That is precisely the case here. There is no burden to the parties or the Board in retaining the deadlines set in the scheduling orders in these proceedings. The Board is free to set the trial date for these proceedings in consecutive time slots at a later date if it so chooses.

If the Board would like to have a call to discuss this request, the parties can quickly confer and provide times of availability.

Sincerely,
Thomas Finch
Counsel for Patent Owner

Tom Finch | Senior Associate
Perilla Knox & Hildebrandt LLP
5871 Glenridge Drive | Suite 350 | Atlanta, GA 30328
O: (470) 942-5039 | F: (877) 389-6779
www.pkhip.com