

From: [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
To: [Brad Bowling](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
Cc: [Lisa Thomas](#); [Kevin Cadwell](#); [Jim Thomas](#); [David Radulescu](#); [Bryon Wasserman](#); [Jesco-IPR_Service@radip.com](#)
Subject: RE: Jesco Lighting Group, LLC v. AGS Lighting Management LLC, Case No. IPR2025-01328
Date: Friday, November 7, 2025 12:50:52 PM

Counsel,

The Board will accept the brief as filed. If Petitioner feels it needs extra pages, it can send us an email request to this mailbox outlining the reason(s) why.

From: Brad Bowling <bbowling@ccrtlaw.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 6, 2025 9:59 AM
To: Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>
Cc: Lisa Thomas <lthomas@ccrtlaw.com>; Kevin Cadwell <kcadwell@ccrtlaw.com>; Jim Thomas <jthomas@fyiplaw.com>; David Radulescu <david@radip.com>; Bryon Wasserman <bryon@radip.com>; Jesco-IPR_Service@radip.com
Subject: Jesco Lighting Group, LLC v. AGS Lighting Management LLC, Case No. IPR2025-01328

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

Dear Director,

Counsel for Patent Owner AGS Lighting respectfully requests leave to file a discretionary denial brief that comports with the 20-page limit recently set on the Patent Office website. As filed, Patent Owner's discretionary denial brief was 29 pages, with 5857 words. When filing the brief, Patent Owner applied the limit that was in effect when the bifurcated discretionary denial briefing schedule was implemented, i.e. 14,000 words. That limit was changed recently for discretionary denial requests filed after September 1, 2025. Here, Patent Owner filed its request for discretionary denial on October 1, 2025, in close proximity to the rule change. Patent Owner's brief is 5,857 words, well within the word limit Patent Owner believed applied to its brief. Patent Owner's filing of a 29-page brief was an inadvertent error and not a strategic decision designed to provide any tactical advantage.

Patent Owner first became aware of its oversight when the error was called out in footnote 1 in Petitioner's opposition brief, which was filed on November 3, 2025. Patent Owner had not been aware of its error before Petitioner's opposition brief. Petitioner had never raised this with the Patent Owner before that time. The very next morning, Patent Owner reached out to Petitioner to let Petitioner know that Patent Owner would seek leave from the Director to file a discretionary denial brief that comports with the 20-

page limit and which does not contain any new arguments. Patent Owner also informed Petitioner that Patent Owner would not be opposed to a subsequent filing by Petitioner of a corrected responsive brief that updates any citations to Patent Owner's corrected brief and that does not contain any new arguments. Patent Owner requested Petitioner's position on this issue, but Petitioner has not yet responded.

Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Director grant Patent Owner leave to file a discretionary denial brief that comports with the 20-page limit and that contains no new arguments.

In the alternative, Patent Owner requests that the Director retroactively waive the 20-page limit for Patent Owner's discretionary denial brief and allow it to stand as filed because Petitioner has already responded to the brief and chose not to move to strike the portions of the discretionary denial brief that exceeded the 20-page limit or to raise the page-limit issue at any time prior to the filing of its opposition brief on November 3, 2025.

Thank you

BRADLEY S. BOWLING
CCRT LAW
713.715.5816 office
281.217.1543 mobile