

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GE HEALTHCARE LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,
Patent Owner.

IPR2026-00069
Patent 11,938,201

Before DEBRA L. DENNETT and DEVON ZASTROW NEWMAN,
*Administrative Patent Judges.*¹

DENNETT, Administrative Patent Judge.

Granting Petitioner's Motion to Seal
37 C.F.R. § 42.14

¹ Judge Jamie T. Wisz is a member of the panel but was unavailable at the time this order was issued. This order is entered by the remaining members of the panel, who constitute a quorum.

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner filed a Motion to Seal (Paper 27) concurrently with filing its Reply (Paper 24 (sealed), Paper 25 (redacted)) on August 20, 2026.

Petitioner represents that Patent Owner does not oppose the Motion. Paper 27, 1. On July 1, 2026, the Board entered a Modified Protective Order (MPO) limiting access to highly confidential business information to specified persons. Paper 19 (Order); Paper 17, App. A (MPO).

II. MOTION TO SEAL

The record of an inter partes review shall be made available to the public, except as otherwise ordered, and a document filed with a motion to seal shall be treated as sealed until the motion is decided. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(1); 37 C.F.R. § 42.14. Only “confidential information” may be protected against public disclosure. 35 U.S.C. § 316(a)(7); 37 C.F.R. § 42.54. The Board observes a strong public policy in favor of making information filed in inter partes review proceedings open to the public. *See Argentum Pharms. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd.*, IPR2017-01053, Paper 27 at 3–4 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2018) (informative). The standard for granting a motion to seal is “good cause.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.54(a). The moving party bears the burden of showing that the relief requested should be granted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c). This includes a sufficient showing that (1) the information sought to be sealed is truly confidential, (2) a concrete harm would result upon public disclosure, (3) there exists a genuine need to rely in the trial on the specific information sought to be sealed, and (4), on balance, an interest in maintaining confidentiality outweighs the strong public interest in having an open record. *Argentum*, Paper 27 at 3–4; *see also Corning Optical Commc’ns RF, LLC v. PPC Broadband, Inc.*, IPR2014-00440, Paper 46 at 2

(PTAB April 6, 2015) (requiring a showing that information has not been “excessively redacted”). Upon review of Petitioner’s Motion to Seal, we are persuaded that good cause exists to seal the unredacted versions of the papers and exhibits identified in the Motion. *See* Paper 24, Ex. 1070 (sealed version), Ex. 1071(sealed version). Petitioner has narrowly tailored the redacted portions of each paper and exhibit so as to protect sensitive or otherwise confidential information while balancing the public interest in an open record. *See* Paper 24, Ex. 1070 (redacted version), Ex. 1071 (redacted version).

III. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion to Seal (Paper 27 is granted with respect to Paper 24 and Exhibits 1070 and1071 in the above-captioned proceeding.

IPR2026-00069
Patent 11,938,201

FOR PETITIONER:

Jeffrey Kushan
Lauren Katzeff
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
jkushan@sidley.com
lkatzeff@sidley.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Eldora Ellison
Olga Partington
Christopher Gallo
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
ellison-ptab@sternekessler.com
opartington-ptab@sternekessler.com
cgallo-ptab@sternekessler.com