

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SNAP INC. and HISENSE USA CORPORATION,

Petitioners

v.

NOKIA TECHNOLOGIES OY,

Patent Owner.

IPR2025-01440
U.S. Patent No. 7,532,808

**PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR
DISCRETIONARY DENIAL**

Mail Stop PATENT BOARD
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	THE DIRECTOR SHOULD EXERCISE DISCRETION UNDER SECTION 314 AND DENY INSTITUTION	1
A.	The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Weigh in Favor Of Discretionary Denial	2
B.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factors 1-3 and 5 – A Stay of the District Court Case is Unlikely to Continue	3
C.	<i>Fintiv</i> Factor 6 – Other Considerations Weigh Heavily In Favor of Discretionary Denial	8
II.	THE FACTORS IDENTIFIED IN THE DIRECTOR’S MARCH 26, 2025, MEMORANDUM WEIGH HEAVILY IN FAVOR OF DISCRETIONARY DENIAL	10
A.	The Claims Of The ’808 Patent Have Been Held Valid In A Prior ITC Proceeding	10
B.	Settled Expectations Weigh In Favor Of Denial.....	12
C.	Petitioners Reliance On Expert Testimony Favors Denial	13
III.	POLICY CONSIDERATIONS SUPPORT DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF INSTITUTION	15
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 11, 6 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020)	passim
<i>Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.</i> , IPR2020-00019, Paper 15, 7-8 (PTAB May 13, 2020) (order denying institution) (informative, designated July 13, 2020)	2, 3
<i>Celltrion, Inc. v. Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00456, Paper 14, 2 (Director June 25, 2025)	12
<i>Certain Video Capable Electronic Devices, Including Computers, Streaming Devices, Televisions, and Components and Modules Thereof</i> , Inv. No. 337-TA-1379 (ITC)	11
<i>Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Quicker Connections LLC</i> , IPR2025-01088, Paper 14 (Director Oct. 17, 2025)	12
<i>Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech.</i> , 815 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2016)	2
<i>Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC</i> , 2025 WL 1318188 (Fed. Cir. 2025)	5, 6
<i>Intel Corporation et al v. General Video, LLC</i> , IPR2025-01036, Paper 13 (Director Oct. 17, 2025)	12
<i>Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Stellar, LLC</i> , IPR2024-01205, Paper 19 (PTAB March 28, 2025)	5
<i>NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex, Inc.</i> , IPR2018-00752, Paper 8, 11 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018) (precedential, designated May 7, 2019)	2
<i>Webgroup Czech Republic, A.S. v. Dish Technologies LLC</i> , IPR2025-00467, Paper 14, 2-3 (PTAB July 16, 2025)	11

STATUTES

35 U.S.C. § 102	16
35 U.S.C. § 314	1, 2

OTHER AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 42.108(d)	16
-----------------------------	----

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

Ex. No.	Title	Previously Submitted
2001	Order On Defendants’ Unopposed Motion For a Stay Pending ITC Proceeding and Extension of Time to Respond to Complaint in <i>Nokia Technologies Oy v. Hisense Co. Ltd. et al.</i> , Case No. 1:25-cv-01871-TWT (N.D.G.A.), dated June 5, 2025	
2002	Order No. 23 - Amended Adopted Procedural Schedule in Investigation No. 337-TA-1448, dated September 30, 2025	
2003	Northern District of Georgia Local Patent Rules	
2004	Original Complaint in <i>Nokia Technologies Oy v. ASUSTeK Computer Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2-25-cv-03053 (C.D. Cal.), dated April 7, 2025	
2005	Original Complaint in <i>Nokia Technologies Oy v. Acer Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 1-25-cv-00523 (W.D. Tex.), dated April 7, 2025	
2006	Order Granting Defendants’ Unopposed Motion to Stay Pending United States International Trade Commission (“ITC”) Proceedings in <i>Nokia Technologies Oy v. ASUSTeK Computer Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 2-25-cv-03053 (C.D. Cal.), dated July 31, 2025	
2007	Order Granting Unopposed Motion to Stay in <i>Nokia Technologies Oy v. Acer Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 1-25-cv-00523 (W.D. Tex.), dated June 13, 2025	
2008	Central District of California Time to Milestones	
2009	Western District of Texas Time to Milestones	
2010	Original Complaint in <i>Nokia Technologies Oy v. Paramount Skydance Corporation et al.</i> , Case No. 1-25-cv-01054 (D. Del.), dated August 21, 2025	
2011	Original Complaint in <i>Nokia Technologies Oy v. Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. et al.</i> , Case No. 1-25-cv-01337 (D. Del.), dated Nov. 1, 2025	
2012	District of Delaware Default Standard for Discovery	
2013	Public Version of Initial Determination on Violation of Section 337 and Recommended Determination on	

	Remedy and Bond in Investigation No. 337-TA-1379, dated January 29, 2025	
2014	Respondents Final Invalidity Contentions in Investigation No. 337-TA-1379, dated April 8, 2024	
2015	Exhibit A-2 Claim Chart Regarding U. S. Patent No. 7,532,808, in Investigation No. 337-TA-1379	
2016	Exhibit A-9 Claim Chart Regarding U. S. Patent No. 7,532,808, in Investigation No. 337-TA-1379	
2017	Exhibit A-10 Claim Chart Regarding U. S. Patent No. 7,532,808, in Investigation No. 337-TA-1379	
2018	Exhibit A-11 Claim Chart Regarding U. S. Patent No. 7,532,808, in Investigation No. 337-TA-1379	
2019	Original Complaint in <i>Nokia Technologies Oy v. Hisense Co. Ltd. et al.</i> , Case No. 1:25-cv-01871-TWT (N.D.G.A.), dated April 7, 2025	
2020	USPTO Proposed Revision to Rules of Practice before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, 37 CFR Part 42, RIN 0651-AD89, Docket No. PTO-P-2025-0025, dated Oct. 17, 2025	

Pursuant to the Director’s March 26, 2025 Memorandum concerning “Interim Processes for PTAB Workload Management” (“March 26, 2025 Memorandum”), Patent Owner Nokia Technologies Oy (“Nokia”) respectfully requests that the Director exercise his discretion and deny institution of Petitioners’ Snap, Inc. and Hisense USA Corporation’s (collectively, “Petitioners”) Petition for *inter partes* review of U.S. Patent No. 7,532,808 (“the ’808 Patent”).

This Petition presents a clear case in which both the *Fintiv* factors and the Director’s March 26, 2025, Memorandum strongly support discretionary denial of institution. While the district court litigation regarding the ’808 Patent between Patent Owner and Petitioner Hisense is presently stayed, the stay is not likely to continue until the Board’s final written decision (“FWD”) in this IPR. Additionally, the validity of the ’808 Patent, which issued over 16 years ago, has already been confirmed over a primary reference asserted in this IPR. Petitioners’ failure to mention this critical fact is clear—the Director has found that prior adjudications of validity weigh in favor of discretionary denial of institution.

For these reasons and the reasons identified below, Nokia respectfully requests that the Director exercise discretion under § 314(a) and deny institution.

I. THE DIRECTOR SHOULD EXERCISE DISCRETION UNDER SECTION 314 AND DENY INSTITUTION

35 U.S.C. § 314(a) provides the Director with discretion to deny institution of any *inter partes* review proceeding because of the state of parallel proceedings

regarding the same issues and patents. 35 U.S.C. § 314(a); *Harmonic Inc. v. Avid Tech.*, 815 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (“[T]he PTO is permitted, but never compelled, to institute an IPR proceeding.”). The Director has applied that discretion where efficiency considerations stemming from parallel proceedings on the same patent warrant denial of institution. *See NHK Spring Co. v. Intri-Plex, Inc.*, IPR2018-00752, Paper 8, 11 (PTAB Sept. 12, 2018) (precedential, designated May 7, 2019) (“*NHK Spring*”).

A. The *Fintiv* Factors Weigh in Favor Of Discretionary Denial

The Director should deny institution under 35 U.S.C. § 314 because the *Fintiv* factors favor discretionary denial. *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 11, 6 (PTAB Mar. 20, 2020) (precedential) (“*Fintiv I*”); *Apple Inc. v. Fintiv, Inc.*, IPR2020-00019, Paper 15, 7-8 (PTAB May 13, 2020) (order denying institution) (informative, designated July 13, 2020) (“*Fintiv II*”).

Six factors stemming from the decisions in *Fintiv I* and *Fintiv II* are considered by the Director when determining whether efficiency considerations mandate discretionary denial in view of a parallel proceeding. These factors include: (1) whether the court granted a stay or evidence exists that one may be granted if a proceeding is instituted; (2) proximity of the court’s trial date to the Board’s projected statutory deadline for a final written decision; (3) investment in the parallel proceeding by the court and the parties; (4) overlap between issues

raised in the petition and the parallel proceeding; (5) whether the petitioner and the defendant in the parallel proceeding are the same party; and (6) other circumstances that impact the Board's exercise of discretion. *Fintiv I* at 5-6. When deciding whether to exercise discretion in denying institution of *inter partes* review, the Board typically "takes a holistic view of whether efficiency and integrity of the system are best served by denying or instituting review." *Fintiv II* at 7-8. A holistic view of the current proceedings warrants denial.

B. *Fintiv* Factors 1-3 and 5 – A Stay of the District Court Case is Unlikely to Continue

Fintiv factors 1-3 and 5 concern whether this IPR can serve the goals of efficiency and avoid duplicative efforts in view of the *five* co-pending litigations and weigh heavily in favor of discretionary denial. *Fintiv I*, 5-6.

i. Northern District of Georgia Litigation

While the parallel Northern District of Georgia case between Patent Owner and Petitioner Hisense is currently stayed pending ITC Inv. No. 337-TA-1448 ("the -1448 ITC Investigation."),¹ the stay is expected to lift shortly after the ITC issues a Final Determination in June 2026. Ex-2001 at 1; Ex-2002 at 2 (noting June 3, 2026 deadline for Final ID). A FWD in this IPR is not expected until nine months later. At that time, the district court litigants will likely have served infringement and

¹ The '808 Patent is not asserted in the -1448 ITC Investigation.

invalidity contentions and fully briefed claim construction. *See* Ex-2003 (Northern District of Georgia Local Patent Rules) at 9, 12-15 (setting the deadline to complete claim construction briefing as 180 days (or 6 months) after the filing of the Joint Preliminary Report and Discovery Plan). Petitioner Hisense has not indicated it will seek a stay of the Northern District of Georgia litigation or argued that one is likely to be granted.

Nor has Petitioner Hisense confirmed that it will not pursue invalidity arguments based on the same references asserted in this IPR in the Northern District of Georgia litigation. While Petitioner Hisense provided a belated, limited stipulation the day before this brief was due (*see* Ex-1019; *see also* Interim Director Discretionary Process at I.D. (Stipulations), available at <https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/interim-director-discretionary-process> (“If a petitioner chooses to file a stipulation, such as a *Sotera* stipulation, they should file it as soon as practicable”)), it has not agreed to forego the assertion of the references in this IPR (in combination with other art) nor the assertion of system art. Thus, Petitioner Hisense’s scant stipulation does little to quell the Director’s concerns regarding parallel or duplicative adjudications.

Even if Petitioner Hisense was to provide a *Sotera* stipulation, it would be ineffective and would not overcome the other *Fintiv* factors that weigh in favor of denial of institution. As the PTAB’s March 24 Memorandum noted, “a timely-filed

Sotera stipulation ... will not be dispositive by itself” and will instead be considered as part of the Board’s “holistic analysis under *Fintiv*.” March 24, 2025, Memo, 2-3. As the Director held in *Motorola Solutions, Inc. v. Stellar, LLC*, IPR2024-01205, Paper 19 (PTAB March 28, 2025), a *Sotera* stipulation does not ensure that the “IPR proceedings would be a ‘true alternative’ to the district court proceeding.” *Id.*, 3-4. This is especially true where Petitioners’ invalidity arguments rely on “unpublished system art, which [a *Sotera* stipulation] is not likely to moot.” *Id.*, 4.

Further, a *Sotera* (or lesser) stipulation cannot outweigh the remaining *Fintiv* factors nor the fact that the Challenged Claims were adjudicated to be valid by the ITC in a prior proceeding, all of which weigh heavily in favor of denial of institution. As the Board held in *Samsung Elecs. Co. Ltd et al. v. Mullen Indus. LLC*, “[u]nder *Fintiv*’s holistic assessment, the merits of the Petition and Petitioner’s *Sotera* stipulation do not outweigh *Fintiv* factors 2 and 3.” IPR2024-01472, Paper 19, 3 (PTAB July 17, 2025). The same is true here, where *Fintiv* factors 1-3 and 5 weigh heavily in favor of denial of institution.

Finally, a *Sotera* (or lesser) stipulation is ineffective in view of the Federal Circuit’s recent decision in *Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC*, 2025 WL 1318188 (Fed. Cir. 2025). *Ingenico* effectively eliminated, in large part, IPR estoppel by holding that “IPR estoppel does not preclude a petitioner from asserting the same prior art raised in an IPR in district court.” *Id.*, *7. Specifically, in view of the holding

in *Ingenico*, a party can assert the same prior art raised in IPR grounds in parallel litigation. For example, *Ingenico* held that “IPR estoppel does not preclude a petitioner from asserting that a claimed invention was known or used by others, on sale, or in public use in district court” based on the same prior art used in the IPR. *Id.*, *7. Thus, according to *Ingenico*, as long as ***the same prior art*** is presented in the parallel proceeding ***under a different basis of invalidity under 35 U.S.C.*** (e.g., “known or used by others” rather than “a printed publication”), a party submitting a *Sotera* stipulation is not estopped from using that same art in the parallel proceeding.

For these reasons, neither Petitioner Hisense’s narrow stipulation nor a late-filed *Sotera* stipulation have a meaningful effect on the invalidity proceedings in the parallel Northern District of Georgia litigation and cannot overcome the other *Fintiv* factors that strongly weigh in favor of denial of institution.

ii. Central District of California and Western District of Texas Litigations

The ’808 Patent has also been asserted in litigation against third-parties ASUSTeK Computer, Inc. et al. and Acer Inc. et al. in the Central District of California and Western District of Texas, respectively. Ex-2004; Ex-2005. While the litigations are similarly stayed pending the -1448 ITC Investigation, both are expected to resume long before the Board issues its FWD (Ex-2006; Ex-2007) after which the parties will begin discovery and the claim construction process. Both

litigations are expected to reach the *Markman* phase before the conclusion of this IPR. Ex-2008 (C.D. Cal. Time to Milestones); Ex-2009 (W.D. Tex. Time to Milestones).

iii. District of Delaware Litigations

The '808 Patent has also been asserted in litigation against third-parties Paramount Skydance Corporation et al. and Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. et al. in the District of Delaware. Ex-2010; Ex-2011. While scheduling orders have not yet issued, the litigations are expected to have significantly advanced by the time the Board issues a final written decision in this IPR. Ex-2012 (D. Del. Default Standard for Discovery) at 4-5 (timeline for Initial Discovery in Patent Litigation).

In view of the *five* other proceeding in which the validity of the '808 Patent will be at issue, this IPR is nothing more than a waste of Board and party resources and a serial attack on the '808 Patent. Accordingly, *Fintiv* factors 1-3 and 5 favor discretionary denial of institution in view of the significant investments the parties are expected to make in multiple parallel proceedings before the Board is scheduled to issue a FWD in this IPR.

C. *Fintiv* Factor 6 – Other Considerations Weigh Heavily In Favor of Discretionary Denial

The final *Fintiv* factor concerns other circumstances that impact the Board’s exercise of discretion, including the merits—weighs strongly in favor of discretionary denial. Petitioners assert two invalidity grounds in this IPR:

Ground		Claims	Prior Art
1	§103	10-11, 15-16, 20-22, 44, 47-49, 51-54, 58-60, 62-64	Karczewicz
2		10-11, 15-16, 20-22, 44, 47-49, 51-54, 58-60, 62-64	MPEG-1, H.263

Petition at 2. However, Petitioners fail to mention that the ITC has already determined that MPEG-1—Ground 2’s primary reference—does not disclose or render obvious the ’808 Patent claims. Ex-2013 (-1379 ITC Public Initial Determination) at 51-59. Petitioners have not explained why or how the Board might reach a different conclusion here.

Petitioners’ other arguments fair no better. Petitioners’ grounds fail to disclose or suggest a single coding mode that meets the ’808 Patent’s skip coding mode. For example, Petitioners point to Karczewicz’s mutually exclusive disclosures of 1) coding a segment using a zero motion vector; and 2) coding a segment using a prediction field, to satisfy the ’808 Patents singular skip coding mode. These modes are mutually exclusive: A block cannot both be coded with an explicit zero motion vector and have its motion predicted. Petitioners acknowledge

that these are two separate techniques for coding a block. *See* Petition at 17 (“[w]hile Karczewicz lists these two functionalities as separate coding modes, a POSITA would have understood the functionality of these two modes together corresponds to the ’808 Patent’s ‘modified’ ‘skip coding mode.’”)

Petitioners also fail to explain how a POSITA would modify Karczewicz’s two techniques to arrive at a single coding mode that functions as the ’808 Patent’s skip coding mode. Petitioners claim that this mode would be “coded with a zero MCI bit.” Petition at 18. However, Petitioners ignore that additional signaling would be required to distinguish between the two mutually exclusive techniques that would have allegedly been combined together.

Further, Petitioners’ reliance on the combination of MPEG-1 and H.263 fails to disclose the skip coding mode of the ’808 Patent. Petitioners claim that a POSITA would have found it obvious to combine MPEG-1’s B-picture skip mode with the motion vector prediction method of H.263. Petition at 62. However, Petitioners’ alleged combination ignores the “active” and “non-active” distinctions present in the proposed claim construction. Petitioners’ combination functions exactly the same regardless of any determination of active and non-active, always performing active motion vector prediction and predicting a zero motion vector only “in the case where the median of MV1, MV2, and MV3 is 0.” Petition at 59-60.

Accordingly, Petitioners’ Grounds in this IPR are likely to fail.

II. THE FACTORS IDENTIFIED IN THE DIRECTOR'S MARCH 26, 2025, MEMORANDUM WEIGH HEAVILY IN FAVOR OF DISCRETIONARY DENIAL

The Director's March 26, 2025, Memorandum, notes that "consistent with the discretionary considerations enumerated in existing Board precedent (including *Fintiv*, *General Plastic*, and *Advanced Bionics*) and the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (Nov. 2019), the parties are permitted to address all relevant considerations" that weigh in favor of discretionary denial." March 26, 2025, Memo, 2 (citations omitted). These factors include: (1) whether the PTAB or another forum has already adjudicated the validity or patentability of the challenged patent claims; (2) whether there have been changes in the law or new judicial precedent issued since issuance of the claims that may affect patentability; (3) the strength of the unpatentability challenge; (4) the extent of the petition's reliance on expert testimony; (5) settled expectations of the parties, such as the length of time the claims have been in force; (6) compelling economic, public health, or national security interests; and (7) any other considerations bearing on the Director's discretion. *Id.* at 2-3. As discussed in detail below, these factors weigh heavily in favor of discretionary denial, and Nokia respectfully requests that the Director deny institution.

A. The Claims Of The '808 Patent Have Been Held Valid In A Prior ITC Proceeding

While Petitioners note that an earlier-filed ITC proceeding is a "Related Matter," Petitioners fail to inform the Board that the ITC held the '808 Patent to be

valid in that proceeding. Petition, 87 (citing *Certain Video Capable Electronic Devices, Including Computers, Streaming Devices, Televisions, and Components and Modules Thereof*, Inv. No. 337-TA-1379 (ITC), filed October 31, 2023) (“-1379 ITC Investigation”). Petitioners’ omission of this prior ITC ruling hides the fact that the very same prior art asserted in the -1379 ITC Investigation is now being reasserted in this Petition.

In the -1379 ITC Investigation, the ’808 Patent was asserted against Amazon and HP (“Respondents”), and Respondents served invalidity contentions in connection with its defense of that matter. Prior art asserted by Amazon and HP ***was the very same prior art being asserted by Petitioners in this IPR***. Compare EX-2015 (Exhibit A-2, charting “Karczewicz”), EX-2015 (Exhibit A-9, charting “MPEG-1”), and EX-2016 (Exhibit A-11, charting “H.263”) with Petition at 2; *see also* EX-2015 (Exhibit A-10, charting “H.236”). While Respondents elected to drop the Karczewicz and H.263 references in the -1379 ITC Investigation to narrow their case for summary determination and trial, ***the ITC ultimately held that the ’808 Patent was valid in its Initial Determination***. Ex-2013 (-1379 ITC Public Initial Determination), 51-59. This prior ITC adjudication of validity of the Challenged Claims of the ’808 Patent weighs heavily in favor of discretionary denial, particularly in light of the Petitioners’ failure to rebut or even address this prior determination. *See, e.g., Webgroup Czech Republic, A.S. v. Dish Technologies LLC*,

IPR2025-00467, Paper 14, 2-3 (PTAB July 16, 2025); *Celltrion, Inc. v. Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, IPR2025-00456, Paper 14, 2 (Director June 25, 2025).

B. Settled Expectations Weigh In Favor Of Denial

The '808 Patent issued on May 12, 2009. By the time the Board issues an Institution Decision in this case (March 2026), over seventeen years will have passed since issuance, giving rise to settled expectations. *Intel Corporation et al v. General Video, LLC*, IPR2025-01036, Paper 13 (Director Oct. 17, 2025); *Cisco Systems, Inc. v. Quicker Connections LLC*, IPR2025-01088, Paper 14 (Director Oct. 17, 2025). Because there are no legitimate reasons to use Board resources to disturb these settled expectations, this factor weighs in favor of discretionary denial. *Id.* Petitioner Hisense makes and sells many products, including smart televisions, that rely on the inventions disclosed in the '808 Patent. These products are identified in the Northern District of Georgia complaint. Ex-2019. Moreover, Petitioner Hisense has been in licensing negotiations with Patent Owner since at least 2018 in connection with H.264 and H.265 related video technology (EX-2019, ¶¶40-45), and Petitioner Snap has been aware of Patent Owner's patents in the same video coding technology space since at least the filing of the -1379 ITC Investigation in 2023. Because Petitioners without question make and sell products that operate in the same video coding technology space encompassed by the '808 Patent, Petitioners were or should have been on notice of the '808 Patent and anticipated Patent Owner's assertion of its

intellectual property rights. Moreover, Patent Owner has a well-established patent licensing program relating to the video coding technology space, of which Petitioners are aware, and has negotiated dozens of license agreements for video coding technology patents. EX-2019, ¶5.

C. Petitioners Reliance On Expert Testimony Favors Denial

The Acting Director of the USPTO considers the “extent of the petition’s reliance on expert testimony” when determining discretionary denial. The USPTO’s FAQs for discretionary denial explain that “[t]he failure to provide focused expert testimony may weigh against institution.” FAQs for Interim Processes for PTAB Workload Management (available at <https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/faqs/interim-processes-workload-management>) at Q.22. This factor favors denial: Petitioners rely heavily on expert argument and inferences to fill the prior art’s gaps and allegedly arrive at the claimed invention.

Petitioners rely on expert testimony for every cited claim limitation in each Ground, citing to Dr. Saber’s declaration over 120 times. This overreliance on expert testimony by Petitioners defeats the purpose of providing expert testimony in the first place, which is to provide “focused testimony, for example to provide helpful context or to explain terms of art.” *See* FAQs for Interim Processes for PTAB Workload Management at Q.22. The declarations lack focus because they provide only a cursory analysis of the prior art using language that tracks the Petition. For

example, Petitioners rely on Dr. Saber to argue that a POSITA would understand Karczewicz's two modes would be treated as a single mode by a POSITA. Petition at 18-19. Dr. Saber merely parrots similar language as the Petition and offers no explanation as to how the two "modes" could be combined into a single mode without requiring the signaling of additional information. Saber Dec., ¶¶ 92-95. As another example, Petitioners rely on Dr. Saber to claim that coincidentally calculating a zero motion vector in the combination of MPEG-1 and H.263 is equivalent to the '808 Patent's active and non-active motion vectors because no "analysis" is required by the claims, using nearly identical language. Saber Dec. ¶¶ 201-205 and Petition at 58-62. These are just examples of the overarching pattern contained throughout the Petition and expert declarations. This use of expert testimony distracts from what the purpose of expert testimony should be, to help aide the Board with context explanations of the prior art.

Patent Owner, in its POPR, will explain why Petitioners' arguments, assumptions, and inferences are incorrect and do not meet the claim limitations. Regardless, because of Petitioners' extensive reliance on the expert testimony of another expert, this dispute is better suited to be resolved in other venues, and this factor favors denial of institution. *See* FAQs for Interim Processes for PTAB Workload Management at Q.22.

III. POLICY CONSIDERATIONS SUPPORT DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF INSTITUTION

On October 17, 2025, the PTO issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“NPRM”) setting forth the PTO’s vision for the efficient management of IPR proceedings before the PTAB and to “promote fairness, efficiency, and predictability in patent disputes.” EX-2020, 2. The PTO explicitly acknowledged that “[s]erial and parallel validity challenges remain a significant problem for the patent system.” *Id.*, 4. The NPRM notes that “more than 80% of IPRs have co-pending district court litigation where the petitioner is also challenging validity” and that “even when a patent is challenged by only one IPR petition, it will usually be challenged twice—once in the IPR and once in district court or at the ITC.” *Id.*, 4-5. That is clearly the case in this proceeding, where the validity of the ’808 Patent is being challenged in this IPR proceeding and will likely be challenged in multiple parallel district court litigations. *See supra* § I.B.

Recognizing the high cost and unfairness to Patent Owners faced with serial challenges to their patent rights, the PTO proposed rules changes to “increase the reliability of patent rights and the predictability of patent disputes” to “enhance fairness, efficiency, and predictability.” EX-2020, 7-9. The proposed rule changes in the NPRM would mandate that a petitioner stipulate that, if trial is instituted in the IPR, “the petitioner and any real party in interest or privy of the petitioner will

not raise grounds of invalidity or unpatentability with respect to the challenged patent under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 in any other proceeding.” EX-2020, 22 (proposed rule 37 C.F.R. § 42.108(d), entitled “Required stipulation for efficiency”). Such a stipulation does not exist in this case.

For these reasons, policy considerations related to fairness, cost, efficiency, and quiet title to Patent Owner’s intellectual property rights in the ’808 Patent warrant denial of institution.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Director should exercise his discretion and deny institution.

Dated: November 12, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Scott W. Hejny

Scott W. Hejny

Reg. No. 45,882

shejny@mckoolsmith.com

Eric S. Hansen

Reg. No. 63,095

ehansen@mckoolsmith.com

McKool SMITH, P.C.

300 Crescent Court, Suite 1200

Dallas, TX 75201

Telephone: 214.978.4000

Facsimile: 214.978.4044

*Counsel for Patent Owner,
Nokia Technologies Oy*

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing **PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR DISCRETIONARY DENIAL** has been served on Petitioners via email on the following counsel of record for Petitioners:

Brian E. Ferguson
beferguson@winston.com

Eimeric Reig
ereigplessis@winston.com

Joseph C. Masullo
jmasullo@winston.com

Lauren M. Rennecker
krennecker@winston.com

Patrick J. McKeever
Mckeever-ptab@perkinscoie.com

Jon R. Carter
Carter-ptab@perkinscoie.com

Wei Yuan
Yuan-ptab@perkinscoie.com

Nicholas Lipperd
Lipperd-ptab@perkinscoie.com

Hisense-NokiaIPR@perkinscoie.com

Dated: November 12, 2025

By: /s/ Scott W. Hejny
Scott W. Hejny
Reg. No. 45,882