

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. AND
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioners

v.

MAXELL LTD.,
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2025-01313
Patent No. 10,783,228

**PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S
REQUEST FOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	2
III.	DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS NOT WARRANTED.....	7
A.	The Complex and Diverse District Court Litigation Tips the Balance Against Discretionary Denial.	7
B.	The Examiner’s Material Errors Weigh Against Discretionary Denial.	9
C.	The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Do Not Support Discretionary Denial.	11
1.	Factor 1 (Stay) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.	11
2.	Factor 2 (Trial Date) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.	11
3.	Factor 3 (Parallel Proceeding) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.	12
4.	Factor 4 (Issue Overlap) Weighs Strongly Against Discretionary Denial.	14
5.	Factor 5 (Same Party) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.	16
6.	Factor 6 (Other Considerations) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.	16
D.	The Parties’ Settled Expectations Do Not Support Discretionary Denial.	17
E.	Samsung’s Positions Regarding the ’228 Patent’s Claim Terms Are Entirely Consistent.	19
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Alpinestars S.p.A. v. Dainese S.p.A.</i> , IPR2025-00750, Paper 14 (Acting Director Aug. 14, 2025).....	17
<i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. NL Giken Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00250, Paper 14 (Acting Director May 16, 2025)	12
<i>Apple Inc. v. Apex Beam Techs. LLC</i> , IPR2025-00896, Paper 10 (Acting Director Sept. 3, 2025)	17
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> , 598 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (<i>en banc</i>)	20
<i>Berkshire Hathaway Energy Co. v. Birchtech Corp.</i> , IPR2025-00274, Paper 23 (Acting Director, Jul. 2, 2025).....	17
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. TS-Optics Corp.</i> , IPR2025-00767, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 14, 2025).....	18
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 898 (2014).....	20
<i>RegenX Science, Inc. v. NextGen Biologics, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00620, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 31, 2025).....	18-19
<i>Samsung Display Co., v. Pictiva Displays Int’l Ltd.</i> , IPR2024-01222, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 6, 2025).....	13-14
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. GenghisComm Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2025-00780, Paper 11 (Acting Director Aug. 14, 2025).....	18
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. GenghisComm Holdings, LLC</i> , IPR2025-00788, Paper 12 (Acting Director Aug. 22, 2025).....	18
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Maxell Ltd.</i> , IPR2025-01308, Paper 13 (Dec. 4, 2025)	6

<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Maxell Ltd.,</i> IPR2025-01316, Paper 11 (Nov. 24, 2025)	6
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Mullen Indus. LLC,</i> IPR2024-01472, Paper 9 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 31, 2025)	14
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Staton Techiya, LLC,</i> IPR2022-00302, Paper 13 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 11, 2022)	16
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Wilus Inst. of Standards and Tech. Inc.,</i> IPR2025-00933, Paper 11 (Deputy Director Oct. 10, 2025)	7, 9
<i>Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group-Trucking LLC,</i> IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 16, 2020)	11
<i>SAP Am., Inc. v. Cyandia, Inc.,</i> IPR2024-01432, Paper 14 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 7, 2025)	13
<i>Shenzen Tuoazhu Tech. Co. v. Stratasy, Inc.,</i> IPR2025-00438, Paper 10 (Acting Director Jul. 17, 2025)	7-9, 15
<i>Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.,</i> IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 1, 2020)	14-15
<i>Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC,</i> IPR2025-00217, Paper 9 (Acting Director Jun. 13, 2025)	7-9, 15
<i>Xencor, Inc. v. Merus N.V.,</i> IPR2025-00604, Paper 12 (Acting Director Jul. 17, 2025)	9

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	U.S. Patent No. 10,783,228 (“the ‘228 patent”).
1002	File History of U.S. Patent No. 10,783,228.
1003	Declaration of Dr. Seth Nielson.
1004	U.S. Patent No. 8,976,965 (“Aminzade”).
1005	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2014/0343371 (“Sowers”).
1006	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2015/0347711 (“Soli”).
1007	U.S. Provisional App. No. 62/006,032, to which Soli claims priority.
1008	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2015/0278498 (“Hong”).
1009	A certified translation of Korean Patent App. No. 10-2014-0037156, to which Hong claims priority.
1010	U.S. Patent No. 8,099,109 (“Altman”).
1011	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2014/0107493 (“Yuen”).
1012	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2013/0231574 (“Tran”).
1013	Patent Owner’s infringement contentions cover pleading from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:25-cv-00052 (E.D. Tex.).
1014	Patent Owner’s ‘228 patent infringement contentions claim chart from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:25-cv-00052 (E.D. Tex.).
1015	Petitioner’s “Sotera plus” Stipulation.
1016	Complaint from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:23-cv-00092 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 7, 2023).
1017	Order from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:23-cv-00092 (E.D. Tex. Mar. 21, 2025).
1018	Order from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:23-cv-00092 (E.D. Tex. Jul. 9, 2025).
1019	Order from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:23-cv-00092 (E.D. Tex. May 2, 2025) (public version).
1020	Order from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:23-cv-00092 (E.D. Tex. Sept. 18, 2025) (public version).
1021	Excerpts of the trial transcript from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:23-cv-00092 (E.D. Tex. May 22, 2025).
1022	Letter from Maxell to Samsung dated July 7, 2021.
1023	Email thread between Maxell and Samsung from July 2021 to January 2022.

Exhibit No.	Description
1024	Letter from Maxell to Samsung dated December 29, 2021.
1025	IPR2024-00867, Paper 40 (Petitioner’s Response to Patent Owner’s Request for Authorization to File Materials from Related Matters).
1026	IPR2024-00717, Paper 33 (Order Denying Patent Owner’s Request for Authorization to File Materials).
1027	IPR2024-00828, Paper 42 (Petitioner’s Response to Patent Owner’s Motion to Submit Supplemental Information).
1028	IPR2024-00828, Paper 47 (Petitioner’s Sur-reply to Patent Owner’s Motion to Submit Supplemental Information).
1029	IPR2024-00828, Paper 50 (Order Denying Patent Owner’s Motion to Submit Supplemental Information).
1030	IPR2024-00735, Paper 41 (Petitioner’s Opposition to Motion to Submit Supplemental Information).
1031	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2015/0035643 (“Kursun”).
1032	U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2009/0083847 (“Fadell”).
1033	U.S. Patent No. 9,111,085 (“Darmour”).
1034	Petitioner’s Motion to Stay Pending <i>Inter Partes</i> Review from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:25-cv-00052 (E.D. Tex. Oct. 24, 2025).
1035	“Order Focusing Patent Claims and Prior Art” from <i>Maxell, Ltd. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , No. 5:25-cv-00052 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 18, 2025).

I. INTRODUCTION

The Director should reject Maxell's request for discretionary denial (Paper 8, "DD Brief"). The '228 patent challenged in this IPR issued less than six years ago, and Director policy favors early challenges to patents like this one without settled expectations. The trial in the corresponding district court litigation will take place at least five months after the final written decision. The other *Fintiv* factors also favor institution. In the corresponding district court litigation, Maxell has asserted ten patents in ten different families covering a wide range of technologies, which further favors institution. The examiner's material errors also favor institution.

To try to deflect attention from the weakness of its position, Maxell creates a skewed version of the parties' disputes and lobs untrue accusations that Samsung is acting unreasonably by not surrendering to Maxell's licensing demands. At the same time, Maxell ignores the district court's finding of noninfringement of all five Maxell patents that have been adjudicated, ignores the PTAB's recent string of final written decisions finding claims from Maxell's patents to be unpatentable, and ignores its own problematic conduct during its litigation campaign against Samsung. A holistic assessment of these and other factors warrants denying Maxell's request for discretionary denial.

II. BACKGROUND

Samsung filed the petition in this IPR along with nine others in response to a second district court lawsuit brought by Maxell against Samsung. Although Maxell's brief repeatedly refers to Samsung's "infringement," Maxell omits that the district court found noninfringement of all five adjudicated patents in Maxell's first lawsuit against Samsung. In that lawsuit, Maxell asserted seven patents, which common sense dictates were Maxell's best patents. EX1016, ¶166. The district court severed two of those patents into separate lawsuits. EX1017, 1; EX1018, 1. Of the five remaining patents, the district court granted summary judgment of noninfringement of two patents before trial, and granted judgment as a matter of law of noninfringement of the other three patents after trial. EX1019, 60, 64; EX1020, 39. The district court also granted judgment as a matter of law of invalidity for two of those three patents, finding that the asserted claims improperly claimed subject matter not disclosed in the specification in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 112. EX1020, 27-31, 33-37. Thus, contrary to Maxell's portrayal of Samsung as an "infringer," the district court has determined that Samsung does not infringe any of the five Maxell patents that have been adjudicated so far, and Samsung is rightfully defending itself against additional unfounded infringement claims.

To fully understand the impropriety of Maxell's conduct in its "multi-jurisdictional legal campaign against Samsung" (DD Brief at 10-11), Samsung

provides a brief summary of the history between the parties, which is at odds with Maxell's portrayal. Samsung and Maxell's predecessor, Hitachi, entered into a Patent Sale Agreement in 2011, in which Samsung bought ten patent families and permanently licensed other patents. EX1021, 109:20-110:9. Samsung also obtained a term-limited license to thousands of other patents in Hitachi's portfolio, which expired in 2016. DD Brief at 2. For five years after the expiration of that license, Maxell did not contact Samsung about renewing that license. EX1021, 819:17-820:19. Samsung understandably took this as an indication that Maxell shared Samsung's belief that a renewed license to these patents was unnecessary.

In July 2021, Maxell sent Samsung a letter seeking to start licensing discussions and listing nearly 200 Maxell patents along with vague categories of accused Samsung products. EX1022. Samsung immediately responded, expressing a willingness to talk. EX1023, 8. Maxell waited until December 2021 to send another letter, in which it listed almost 30 additional patents, again with vague categories of Samsung products, bringing the total between the two letters to more than 220 patents. EX1024. Neither letter identified any patents as being particularly important or included any claim charts purporting to show infringement of any of the patents. EX1022; EX1024.

Samsung did what any party in its position would do: it requested claim charts mapped to specific products and features three times. EX1023, 1-4. Despite

falsely alleging that it provided Samsung with “detailed information” about “Samsung’s ongoing use of [Maxell’s] patent technology” (DD Brief at 3)—a claim since disproven for the five patents adjudicated in the first district court action—Maxell refused to provide claim charts or to identify any particular patents of interest so that the parties could have a meaningful discussion. EX1023, 2. Indeed, Maxell admits that it decided not to provide “detailed infringement charts for even a handful of patents” to prevent Samsung from challenging those patents in a declaratory judgment action or, presumably, an IPR. DD Brief at 3-4. Maxell then went silent for 18 months before filing its first lawsuit against Samsung, asserting seven patents in September 2023 that it never highlighted for Samsung other than to list them among the over 200 other patents in Maxell’s 2021 letters.

In response to that lawsuit, Samsung filed seven IPR petitions for six of the seven asserted patents.¹ The PTAB instituted all seven IPRs and recently issued final written decisions in five of them. The PTAB found all challenged claims unpatentable in three decisions (IPR2024-00717, -00828, and -00867), found most challenged claims unpatentable in another (-00735), and found no challenged claims unpatentable in another (-00777).

Before the first district court action even reached trial, Maxell tried to coerce

¹ IPR2024-00717, -00735, -00777, -00828, -00867, -00906, and -00907.

Samsung into taking a license by filing a complaint in the ITC, multiple complaints in Europe's Unified Patent Court, multiple complaints in Japanese courts, and another complaint in the Eastern District of Texas. *See* DD Brief at 4. In response to the second district court lawsuit, Samsung promptly filed petitions seeking IPR of all ten asserted patents. *See* IPR2025-01307 through -01316.

Maxell's patents deserve heightened scrutiny in view of Maxell's pattern of concealing material information from, and submitting contradictory positions to, the Patent Office. In IPR2024-00867, a recent filing revealed that Maxell had been withholding critical information from the PTAB and a Patent Office examiner. EX1025, 5-8. The examiner had been evaluating a continuation of the challenged patent without being notified by Maxell of either the pending IPR challenging similar claims in the challenged patent, or the fact that Maxell had taken a position in district court that contradicted its arguments to distinguish the prior art. *Id.* This was not an isolated incident. The PTAB recently found that Maxell also: (1) failed to disclose to the examiner reviewing a continuation of Maxell's '757 patent the material institution decision in the '757 patent IPR; and (2) failed to disclose to the PTAB the existence of the continuation application. EX1026, 3-6.

Moreover, Maxell repeatedly has submitted contradictory arguments between district court and the PTAB to argue for infringement on the one hand and to try to preserve the validity of its patents on the other. In the May 2025 district

court trial, Maxell’s technical expert opined that a “processor” was “the same” as the claimed “controller,” but in IPR proceedings that same expert unequivocally argued the opposite: “a POSITA would not equate any type of processor to a controller.” See EX1027, 8-10; see also EX1028, 3-5. Maxell again took opposite positions before the district court and the PTAB just six days apart on the issue of whether two touches constitute a single touch operation or multiple touch operations. See EX1019, 63-64. And in two IPRs, Maxell tried to distinguish the prior art by arguing that it lacked discrete “modes” with “wholly different processing operations,” but in the district court trial argued the opposite. EX1027, 8-10. Maxell’s allegation that Samsung has taken inconsistent positions (DD Brief at 12-13) rings hollow because the PTAB already has rejected one such accusation. EX1029, 2 (finding that the allegation that Samsung’s expert took “inconsistent” positions is “false”). It is Maxell that has taken inconsistent positions in these proceedings, not Samsung. See also EX1030, 7-10 (another example).

Maxell has continued that behavior in this round of IPRs by taking inconsistent positions for the ’650 and ’646 patents. *Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Maxell Ltd.*, IPR2025-01308, Paper 13 (Dec. 4, 2025); *Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Maxell Ltd.*, IPR2025-01316, Paper 11 (Nov. 24, 2025). Samsung notes the Board’s order dated December 1, 2025 stating that “[t]he Office received an *ex parte* communication” regarding this and other Samsung IPRs. Paper 9; EX3001.

III. DISCRETIONARY DENIAL IS NOT WARRANTED

A holistic evaluation of *Fintiv* factors and the additional considerations in March 26, 2025 Memorandum show that discretionary denial is not warranted.

A. The Complex and Diverse District Court Litigation Tips the Balance Against Discretionary Denial.

A “complex and diverse” district court litigation “tip[s] the balance against discretionary denial.” *Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*, IPR2025-00217, Paper 9 at 2 (Acting Director Jun. 13, 2025); *see also Shenzhen Tuozhu Tech. Co. v. Stratasys, Inc.*, IPR2025-00438, Paper 10 at 3 (Acting Director Jul. 17, 2025) (same). In *Tesla*, “the district court proceeding involve[d] eleven patents spanning nine different families that involve a diverse range of subject matter.” *Tesla*, Paper 9 at 2-3. In *Tuozhu*, the district court proceeding “involve[d] nine different patents spanning six families that involve a diverse range of subject matter.” *Tuozhu*, Paper 10 at 2. The Acting Director explained that “[t]he large number and vast scope of the patents asserted in the district court litigation ... weighs against discretionary denial, as the Board is better suited to review a large number of patents involving diverse subject matter.” *Tesla*, Paper 9 at 3; *Tuozhu*, Paper 10 at 3; *see also Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Wilus Inst. of Standards and Tech. Inc.*, IPR2025-00933, Paper 11 at 3 (Deputy Director Oct. 10, 2025) (same finding for a “large number and wide scope of patents”).

As in *Tesla*, *Tuozhu*, and *Wilus*, the parallel district court litigation here is

complex and diverse. It involves ten asserted patents spanning ten unique patent families involving disparate technologies, as summarized below. EX1013, 2.

Patent	Title	Technology
7,577,417	Mobile terminal	Power management by adjusting clock speed when a foldable device is closed
7,952,645	Video processing apparatus and mobile terminal apparatus	Video signal correction based on pattern detection
8,180,198	Playlist creating apparatus and method, and dubbing list creating apparatus and method	Playlist recommendation based on other selections
8,471,950	Signal processor for adjusting image quality of an input picture signal	Image processing
10,783,228	Information processing device, application software start-up system, and application software start-up method	Communications between devices related to biometric sensors
10,812,646	Portable terminal apparatus	Different display modes for remote control on a mobile device
11,026,088	Communication system, communication device and communication terminal device	Permitting external entity to display video on a display device on a temporary basis
11,277,650	Contents receiving system and client	Distribution of video from a main terminal to subsidiary terminals
11,812,091	Multimedia player displaying operation panel depending on contents	Displaying different control panels depending on digital content being displayed
12,160,681	Video transmitter apparatus and video receiver apparatus	Screen mirroring video from a source to display device

The parallel district court litigation for this IPR therefore involves a similar number of patents (ten here versus eleven in *Tesla*, nine in *Tuozhu*, and twelve in

Wilus) and more patent families (ten here versus nine in *Tesla*, six in *Tuozhu*, and eight in *Wilus*), making it even more complex and diverse than the parallel litigations in those IPRs. Moreover, unlike *Tesla*, *Tuozhu*, and *Wilus*, the final written decision due date in this proceeding will precede the not-yet-scheduled trial date, as established below for *Fintiv* factor two. And unlike *Tesla*, there has not been a “meaningful investment in the district court litigation by the parties,” as shown below for *Fintiv* factor three. *Tesla*, Paper 8 at 4-5 (*Markman* hearing scheduled months before the institution decision). This proceeding and its parallel litigation therefore present a more compelling case against discretionary denial than *Tesla*, *Tuozhu*, and *Wilus*, where the Acting Director found that the circumstances tipped the balance against discretionary denial.

B. The Examiner’s Material Errors Weigh Against Discretionary Denial.

The Director has consistently found that discretionary denial is inappropriate when the Patent Office materially erred during prosecution of a challenged patent. *E.g.*, *Xencor, Inc. v. Merus N.V.*, IPR2025-00604, Paper 12 at 2-3 (Acting Director Jul. 17, 2025). The ’228 patent examiner never rejected the ’228 patent’s claims in light of the prior art, and allowed the claims because the prior art supposedly did not disclose limitations such as “acquiring dynamic biometric information from a body of a user by a dynamic biometric information acquisition sensor of a first device.” EX1002, 12. But three references considered by the Examiner each

disclose this limitation. EX1031 (Kursun), ¶¶30 (“sensors” for “brain waves/signals, ... heartbeat, pulse”), 69, 131; EX1032 (Fadell), ¶57 (“a sensor for detecting a user’s pulse”); EX1033 (Darmour), 3:37-41 (“sensors to detect ... heart rate”), 3:63-67; *see also* EX1001 (the ’228 patent), 13:54-58 (a heart rate sensor is an example of a dynamic biometric sensor).

Moreover, the examiner allowed the claims based on supposed “reasons argued by Applicants,” but none of those “reasons” relate at all to the substance of the allowed claims. EX1002, 12 (citing certain “Remarks” and an “Interview”), 15 (the interview related only to withdrawn claims), 348-349 (the remarks merely noted the filing of a terminal disclaimer). The examiner therefore materially erred in this second way.

The examiner also failed to realize that the patent’s asserted claims 8-9 and 19-20 are nowhere close to having written description support in the specification. EX1001, 21:26-41, 22:59-23:6. Those claims therefore are not entitled to the June 2014 priority date of the patent’s parent, and instead would have a priority date no earlier than the patent’s August 2019 filing date. *See* EX1001, 1. The examiner materially erred by failing to search for prior art for these claims in that five-year window, and further materially erred by failing to recognize that the parent patent’s publication is prior art to these claims. *See* EX1002, 361-708. The ’228 patent examiner’s material errors further weigh against discretionary denial.

C. The *Fintiv* Factors Do Not Support Discretionary Denial.

The *Fintiv* factors do not support discretionary denial. *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential) (“*Fintiv*”).

1. Factor 1 (Stay) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.

This factor considers “whether a stay exists or is likely to be granted if a proceeding is instituted.” *Fintiv*, Paper 11 at 6. Samsung has filed a pending motion to stay the underlying litigation. EX1034. The Board “will not attempt to predict how the district court ... will proceed” regarding potential stays “because the court may determine whether or not to stay any individual case ... based on a variety of circumstances and facts.” *Sand Revolution II, LLC v. Continental Intermodal Group-Trucking LLC*, IPR2019-01393, Paper 24 at 7 (P.T.A.B. Jun. 16, 2020) (informative). For this reason alone, this factor is neutral and does not support discretionary denial.

Maxell’s framing of the timing of Samsung’s motion to stay as a “tactical maneuver” and “gamesmanship” (DD Brief at 14-15) is baseless because Samsung simply filed the motion shortly after it had filed its last petition for IPR of the Maxell patents asserted in the latest district court action. EX1034 (filed October 24th, eleven days after the October 13th filing of the petition in IPR2025-01310).

2. Factor 2 (Trial Date) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.

This factor considers the “proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s

projected statutory deadline.” *Fintiv*, Paper 11 at 9. This factor weighs against discretionary denial where the statutory deadline precedes the trial date. *E.g.*, *Amazon.com, Inc. v. NL Giken Inc.*, IPR2025-00250, Paper 14 at 2 (Acting Director May 16, 2025) (not denying institution because “it is likely that a final written decision in this proceeding will issue before the district court trial occurs”).

Here, the district court has set a pretrial conference for August 10, 2027, but has not set a trial date. EX2004, 1-2. Trial will be no earlier than August 10, 2027. Maxell’s reliance on average trial date statistics (DD Brief at 15-16) is irrelevant because the court already has set a schedule and will not move a trial date forward. The statutory deadline for the Board’s final written decision is March 5, 2027, more than five months before the earliest possible trial date. This factor therefore weighs strongly against discretionary denial.

3. Factor 3 (Parallel Proceeding) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.

This factor considers “the amount and type of work already completed in the parallel litigation by the court and the parties at the time of the institution decision.” *Fintiv*, Paper 11 at 9. “If, at the time of the institution decision, the district court has not issued orders related to the patent at issue in the petition, this fact weighs against exercising discretion to deny institution.” *Id.* at 10. Here, the district court has not made any substantive rulings on the ’228 patent, and it is unlikely to do so prior to the institution decision deadline in March 2026. EX2004

(Docket Control Order), 5-7. Maxell does not argue otherwise. DD Brief at 17-18.

Maxell’s argument that the parties will “be well into the claim construction process” at the time of the institution decision (DD Brief at 17) ignores the fact that the key milestones of *Markman* briefing and the *Markman* hearing will come after the institution decision deadline of March 5, 2026, as shown below.

Event	Date
Opening Claim Construction Brief	March 11, 2026
Responsive Claim Construction Brief	April 1, 2026
Reply Claim Construction Brief	April 15, 2026
<i>Markman</i> Hearing	May 6, 2026
Fact Discovery Deadline	October 23, 2026
Opening Expert Reports	December 8, 2026
Rebuttal Expert Reports	January 12, 2027
Expert Discovery Deadline	February 2, 2027
Dispositive Motions	February 16, 2027
Dispositive Motion Hearing	May 11, 2027
Pretrial Disclosures	June 22, 2027
Joint Final Pretrial Order	July 13, 2027
Motions <i>in Limine</i>	July 13, 2027
Pretrial Conference	August 10, 2027

EX2004, 2-5; *see also* *SAP Am., Inc. v. Cyandia, Inc.*, IPR2024-01432, Paper 14 at 8-9 (P.T.A.B. Apr. 7, 2025) (this factor favored institution even after *Markman* briefing was complete); *Samsung Display Co., v. Pictiva Displays Int’l Ltd.*, IPR2024-01222, Paper 12 at 7 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 6, 2025) (this factor weighed against denial, even though a *Markman* hearing had been held, in part because “much remain[ed] to be done, including expert discovery”). The schedule also shows that

much work will remain in the district court at the time of the institution decision, which further disfavors discretionary denial. *Samsung Display*, Paper 12 at 7.

Moreover, Samsung was diligent in filing this petition on August 28, 2025, approximately four months after the complaint was filed on April 21, 2025. Samsung also filed this petition only about two weeks after Maxell served preliminary infringement contentions on August 12, 2025, and almost eight months before the statutory deadline. *See Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Mullen Indus. LLC*, IPR2024-01472, Paper 9, at 10 (P.T.A.B. Mar. 31, 2025) (finding diligence when petition was filed less than five months after infringement contentions). This factor therefore weighs strongly against discretionary denial.

4. Factor 4 (Issue Overlap) Weighs Strongly Against Discretionary Denial.

This factor considers the “overlap between issues raised in the petition and in the parallel proceeding.” *Fintiv*, Paper 11 at 12. Samsung has submitted a broadened *Sotera* stipulation (“*Sotera* plus stipulation”) in this IPR. EX1015; *see also Sotera Wireless, Inc. v. Masimo Corp.*, IPR2020-01019, Paper 12 at 18-19 (P.T.A.B. Dec. 1, 2020) (“*Sotera*”) (describing the standard, narrower *Sotera* stipulation). Samsung’s *Sotera* plus stipulation goes beyond the standard *Sotera* stipulation by extending to “any ground based on a combination of system prior art (*i.e.*, prior art that is neither a patent or printed publication) and the references that form the basis of any ground raised in [this IPR]” and “any ground that could be

raised under §§ 102 or 103 on the basis of system art corresponding to a reference that forms the basis of any ground raised in [this IPR].” EX1015, 2. Samsung’s *Sotera* plus stipulation ensures that this IPR will be a true alternative to the parallel district court action. Indeed, the Acting Director described this type of stipulation as “broad” and as a factor that helps “tip the balance against discretionary denial.” *Tuozhu*, Paper 10 at 3; *Shenzen Tuozhu Tech. Co. v. Stratasy, Inc.*, IPR2025-00438, EX1033 at 1 (stipulation with a scope identical to Samsung’s *Sotera* plus stipulation); *see also Tesla*, Paper 9 at 2 (such a stipulation is “broad” and “counsel[s] against discretionary denial”); *Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*, IPR2025-00217, EX1067 at 2 (the stipulation). In view of Samsung’s *Sotera* plus stipulation, this factor weighs against discretionary denial.

This factor also considers whether the IPR petition challenges claims not at issue in the district court, which indicates less issue overlap between the two proceedings. *See Fintiv*, Paper 11 at 12-13. In the district court, Maxell asserts only claims 1-2 and 4-9, but the petition challenges claims 1-22, or fourteen additional claims. EX1013, 2; Paper 3 (Petition) at 1. And the additional challenged claims include claims with materially different scope than the claims at issue in the district court, such as claims 3 and 14 (reciting the use of Wi-Fi Direct), claims 10 and 21 (reciting a determination that the user is in a state matching a predetermined criteria and limiting an operation in response), and

claims 11 and 22 (executing the operation after user confirmation). See EX1001, 20:19-23:17. Furthermore, the district court has issued an order limiting Maxell to “no more than five (5) asserted claims per patent” at trial. EX1035, 2. Thus, the district court will not resolve the patentability of at least 17 of the 22 challenged claims. These facts further reduce the issue overlap between the two proceedings. This factor weighs strongly against discretionary denial.

5. Factor 5 (Same Party) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.

Because Samsung and Maxell are the parties in the district court litigation, and because the Board will issue a final written decision more than five months prior to any trial in the district court, this factor weighs against discretionary denial. *Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Staton Techiya, LLC*, IPR2022-00302, Paper 13 at 18-19 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 11, 2022) (factor five weighs against discretionary denial when the statutory deadline for the final written decision is before the expected trial date in the parallel litigation).

6. Factor 6 (Other Considerations) Does Not Support Discretionary Denial.

This factor considers any “other circumstances” as “part of a balanced assessment of all the relevant circumstances.” *Fintiv*, Paper 11 at 14. Here, the merits of the petition are strong. The petition includes two grounds for each challenged claim. Paper 3 at 1. And the cited prior art collectively discloses every

limitation of each challenged claim. *Id.* at 21-96. Maxell identifies no weakness in any of the challenges. DD Brief at 18-19. This factor therefore also weighs against discretionary denial.

In sum, none of the *Fintiv* factors favor the Director exercising discretion to deny institution and several factors weigh strongly against discretionary denial.

D. The Parties’ Settled Expectations Do Not Support Discretionary Denial.

“[E]arly challenges favor robust, predictable patent rights and weigh against discretionary denial.” *E.g., Alpinestars S.p.A. v. Dainese S.p.A.*, IPR2025-00750, Paper 14 at 2 (Acting Director Aug. 14, 2025). The ’228 patent issued on September 22, 2020, and therefore has been in force for less than six years. The Director has routinely denied requests for discretionary denial for patents that have been in force for less than six years when the *Fintiv* factors weigh against discretionary denial. *See id.*; *Apple Inc. v. Apex Beam Techs. LLC*, IPR2025-00896, Paper 10, at 3 (Acting Director Sept. 3, 2025) (denying request for discretionary denial for patents issued in 2021-2023 when the final written decision was due before the projected trial date and a large number of patents was asserted); *Berkshire Hathaway Energy Co. v. Birchtech Corp.*, IPR2025-00274, Paper 23 at 3 (Acting Director, Jul. 2, 2025) (“Lastly, the challenged patents issued in 2019 and 2020, such that Patent Owner had not developed strong settled expectations that favor discretionary denial.”). The same result should apply here because the ’228

patent has been in force for less than six years and the *Fintiv* factors weigh against discretionary denial.

Maxell's reliance on the *Samsung Elecs. Co. v. GenghisComm Holdings, LLC* cases is misplaced because, in those decisions, the Acting Director found that the *Fintiv* factors favored discretionary denial. DD Brief at 7; IPR2025-00780, Paper 11 at 2; IPR2025-00788, Paper 12 at 2. In contrast, the *Fintiv* factors here weigh strongly against discretionary denial, as established above.

Moreover, Maxell can have no settled expectations about the '228 patent's validity in light of several recent PTAB and district court decisions invalidating claims from patents that Maxell has asserted against Samsung. The PTAB found all challenged claims unpatentable in IPR2024-00717, -00828, and -00867, and found most challenged claims unpatentable in IPR2024-00735. And in Maxell's first lawsuit against Samsung, the district court found claims of Maxell's '086 patent and '815 patents to be invalid based on written description deficiencies. EX1020, 27-31, 33-37. Because Maxell presumably asserted its best patents in its first two lawsuits against Samsung, Maxell cannot have settled expectations of the validity of its third-string '228 patent.

Maxell's argument that Samsung is a "former licensee" does not apply to the '228 patent because it issued in 2020, four years after the Samsung-Hitachi license expired in 2016. DD Brief at 8 (citing *TS-Optics* and *RegenX Science*); *Microsoft*

Corp. v. TS-Optics Corp., IPR2025-00767, Paper 13, at 2 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 14, 2025) (petitioner licensed “the challenged patent”); *RegenX Science, Inc. v. NextGen Biologics, Inc.*, IPR2025-00620, Paper 13, at 2 (P.T.A.B. Jul. 31, 2025) (same). And Maxell’s five-year silence after the expiration of that license gave Samsung settled expectations that it would not be subject to patent infringement claims by Maxell. *See* Section II.

Maxell’s argument that Samsung had “actual notice” of the ’228 patent through Maxell’s December 2021 letter is incorrect because that letter does not identify the ’228 patent. DD Brief at 8 (citing EX2002). Indeed, that letter’s failure to identify the ’228 patent while identifying over two dozen other patents indicates that the ’228 patent was of lesser interest to Maxell. EX2002, 1-6. Moreover, Maxell’s letters to Samsung listed over 220 patents. *See* Section II. Samsung could not have been expected to challenge all 220 patents, and doing so would have unnecessarily strained PTAB resources. Maxell admits that it decided not to provide “detailed infringement charts for even a handful of patents,” and its strategic decision to do so should not be rewarded. DD Brief at 3-4.

E. Samsung’s Positions Regarding the ’228 Patent’s Claim Terms Are Entirely Consistent.

Maxell tries to manufacture “inconsistent” Samsung positions by recasting Samsung’s assertions of lack of written description in the district court as assertions that claim limitations are “unclear [and] ambiguous.” DD Brief at 12-

13. To be clear, Samsung has not asserted that any limitation of any of the ten newly asserted patents is indefinite. EX2015, 175-187 (never asserting indefiniteness). The written description requirement is fundamentally different than indefiniteness—the former considers whether a claim limitation is sufficiently disclosed in the specification and the latter considers whether a claim limitation is sufficiently clear. *Compare Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 598 F.3d 1336, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*en banc*) (under the written description requirement, “the specification must ... show that the inventor actually invented the invention claimed”) *with Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 898, 910 (2014) (“[t]he definiteness requirement ... mandates clarity” of claim terms). For example, when the district court found claims of Maxell’s ’815 patent to be invalid because their “encryption” limitation lacked written description support, it did so because the specification did not disclose that limitation, not because the limitation’s meaning was unclear. EX1020, 35-37. The Director should deny Maxell’s request for discretionary denial for these additional reasons.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Director should deny Maxell’s request.

Date: December 5, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert Buergi

Robert Buergi

Reg. No. 58,125

DLA Piper LLP (US)

845 Texas Avenue, Suite 3800

Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713.425.8440

Fax: 713.300.6040

robert.buergi@dlapiper.com

Attorney for Petitioners

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.

and Samsung Electronics

America, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e) and 42.105 that on December 5, 2025, a true and correct copy of this brief and any new exhibits were served by emailing a copy of the same (by agreement) to the following attorneys for PO:

Robert G. Pluta (rpluta@mayerbrown.com); and

Saqib Siddiqui (ssiddiqui@mayerbrown.com).

A courtesy copy also was sent to via email to:

maxell-samsung-service@mayerbrown.com

Date: December 5, 2025

/s/ Robert Buergi

Reg. No. 58,125

DLA Piper LLP (US)

845 Texas Avenue, Suite 3800

Houston, TX 77002

Phone: 713.425.8440

Fax: 713.300.6040

robert.buergi@dlapiper.com

***Attorney for Petitioners
Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.
and Samsung Electronics
America, Inc.***