From:	Director_Discretionary_Decision
To:	Erin Hadi; Director_Discretionary_Decision
Cc:	Foster, Theo; Theo Foster IPR; David McCombs IPR; Calmann Clements IPR; Brett Bostrom IPR; Matthew.Beck.IPR; Dagim Tilahun IPR; MeshDynamics; Elizabeth Bernard
Subject:	RE: IPR2025-01569 and IPR2026-00008- Authorization to file Motion to Dismiss in parallel proceeding
Date:	Monday, January 12, 2026 10:35:24 AM
Attachments:	image001.png

Patent Owner is authorized to file a 1-page brief in IPR2025-01569 and IPR2026-00008, due no later than Wednesday, January 14, 2026, limited to addressing the matter raised below. Petitioner is authorized a 1-page reply, due no later than Friday, January 16, 2026.

From: Erin Hadi <EHadi@daignaultiyer.com>
Sent: Friday, January 9, 2026 5:01 PM
To: Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>
Cc: Foster, Theo <theo.foster@haynesboone.com>; Theo Foster IPR <ipr.theo.foster@haynesboone.com>; David McCombs IPR <david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com>; Calmann Clements IPR <calmann.clements.ipr@haynesboone.com>; Brett Bostrom IPR <brett.bostrom.ipr@haynesboone.com>; Matthew.Beck.IPR <matthew.beck.ipr@haynesboone.com>; Dagim Tilahun IPR <dagim.tilahun.ipr@haynesboone.com>; MeshDynamics <MeshDynamics@daignaultiyer.com>; Elizabeth Bernard <ebernard@daignaultiyer.com>
Subject: IPR2025-01569 and IPR2026-00008- Authorization to file Motion to Dismiss in parallel proceeding

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

Dear Honorable Board,

On January 8, 2026, the Northern District of California parallel proceeding was dismissed. Patent Owner MeshDynamics respectfully requests authorization to file a 1-page supplemental brief in IPR2025-01569 and IPR2026-00008 addressing the trial date along with the Order Granting the Motion to Dismiss as an accompanying exhibit, attached.

Petitioner's position is as follows: “Petitioner opposes Patent Owner’s request for new briefing as unnecessary in view of the parties’ obligations to update the Board regarding the changed status of the NDCA litigation under 37 C.F.R. 8(a)(3). Petitioner does not oppose the request to file the NDCA dismissal order as an exhibit. If Patent Owner’s request for new briefing is granted, Petitioner requests authorization to file a brief of equal length 3 business days after Patent Owner’s deadline.”

Sincerely,

Erin Hadi

Erin Hadi
Associate
Daignault Iyer LLP

This transmission, and any attached files, may contain information from the law firm of Daignault Iyer LLP which is confidential and/or legally privileged. Such information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom this transmission is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this transmitted information is strictly prohibited, that copies of this transmission and any attached files should be deleted from your disk directories immediately, and that any printed copies of this transmission or attached files should be returned to this firm. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us by telephone or e-mail immediately, and we will arrange for the return to Daignault Iyer LLP of any printed copies.