

From: [Trials](#)
To: [Manuel Tijerino](#); [Arjomand, Mehran](#); [Trials](#)
Cc: [Blumenkopf, Bryan](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2025-01280: Request for Reply to POPR
Date: Monday, October 6, 2025 12:08:29 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

External Email

Counsel,

We authorize the filing of additional briefing in IPR2025-01280, solely to address the issue of a priority claim of the '925 patent, limited to 5 pages, with Petitioner's reply due no later than 7 business days from the date of this email, and Patent Owner's sur-reply due no later than 7 days after Petitioner's reply is filed.

Regards,

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



From: Manuel Tijerino <manueltijerino@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 12:54 PM
To: Arjomand, Mehran <MARjomand@mofo.com>; Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>
Subject: Re: IPR2025-01280: Request for Reply to POPR

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,

In addition to my earlier opposition to Petitioner's request for additional briefing, Patent Owner respectfully submits this clarification regarding Petitioner's assertion that the '925 patent "revoked its priority." The record and official USPTO data confirm that statement is

incorrect.

The 2014 correspondence cited at Exhibit 1002 (pp. 306–307) merely corrected the filing receipt for Application No. 12/804,665 by removing an erroneous *CIP* label. It did **not** disclaim or revoke the domestic-benefit claim to the 2007 parent application. Under **35 U.S.C. § 120** and **37 C.F.R. § 1.78**, continuation priority attaches automatically to applications sharing a common inventor and overlapping disclosure.

The USPTO’s own records confirm this continuity. The Patent Public Search database lists:

Parent: US 11/744,228 (filed May 4, 2007) →

Child: US 12/804,665 (filed July 27, 2010) →

Issued patent: US 9,146,925 B2.

Attached are screenshots from the official USPTO Public Search portal and the face page of the issued patent, which together show that lineage and confirm that the ’925 patent issued from Application No. 12/804,665. Accordingly, nothing in Exhibit 1002 (pp. 306–311) constitutes a revocation of that relationship.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Manuel Tijerino

Patent Owner (Pro Se)

From: Manuel Tijerino <manueltijerino@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 9:54 AM

To: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>; Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>

Cc: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>

Subject: Re: IPR2025-01280: Request for Reply to POPR

Honorable Board,

Patent Owner respectfully confirms that he **opposes** Petitioner’s request for authorization to file a reply to the Patent Owner Preliminary Response.

As reflected in my email to Petitioner’s counsel dated October 2, 2025 (attached below), I expressly opposed any additional briefing. Petitioner’s message correctly notes that I opposed the request, but their characterization of the record in the IPR and the prosecution history is inaccurate.

To clarify, the **parent application priority** is properly claimed in the ’925 patent and was recognized by the USPTO during examination. The Patent Office confirmed to me that the parent’s disclosures and claim language are automatically inherited, consistent with 37 C.F.R.

§ 1.78 and standard continuation practice.

I stand by my Preliminary Response and the record it cites. The Petition already provided Petitioner a full opportunity to present its case. The integrity of the process and the interests of fairness do not require additional briefing beyond what the rules permit.

Respectfully submitted,
Manuel Tijerino
Patent Owner, Pro Se

From: Arjomand, Mehran <MArjomand@mofo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 9:18 AM
To: Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: Blumenkopf, Bryan <BBlumen@mofo.com>; Manuel Tijerino <manueltijerino@hotmail.com>
Subject: IPR2025-01280: Request for Reply to POPR

Honorable Board,

Petitioner respectfully seeks authorization to file a five-page reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 6) filed on September 29, 2025. The POPR mischaracterizes the proceeding's record in a number of ways, such as incorrectly asserting that the '925 patent has a priority claim, even though for example the patent applicant had expressly revoked any such priority claim during prosecution. (*Compare* Paper 6 at 7 *with* Ex. 1002 at 306 and 316; Ex. 1001 (cover page).)

Petitioner's counsel reached out to Patent Owner with respect to its request. Petitioner was willing to not oppose Patent Owner having a five-page sur-reply, if Patent Owner would not oppose a five-page reply by Petitioner. (The reply would be due seven business days from authorization, and the sur-reply would be due seven business days from the filing of the reply.) Patent Owner opposed Petitioner's request.

Patent Owner is copied on this email.

Respectfully,

--Mehran Arjomand

MEHRAN ARJOMAND

Partner | Morrison & Foerster LLP

707 Wilshire Boulevard | Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543

P: +1 (213) 892-5630

=====

This message may be confidential and privileged. Use or disclosure by anyone other than an intended addressee is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please delete it and advise the sender by reply email. Learn about Morrison & Foerster LLP's [Privacy Policy](#).