From:	Trials
To:	"Peters, Steven"; Director_DI
Cc:	MLB-Reed-IPR-955; Gray IV, Andrew J.; Bregman, Dion M.; Restauri, Nicholas A.; Naples, Clement; Yeh, Thomas W.; Schnurer, John
Bcc:	Abraham, Jeffrey; McHenry, Kevin; Pats, Justin; Mattia, Scott; Swift, Erica; Kalan, Kristina
Subject:	RE: IPR2026-00165 - Request for Reply to POPR
Date:	Monday, March 23, 2026 3:26:00 PM
Attachments:	image001.png

Counsel,

Petitioner is authorized to file a 3-page preliminary reply in IPR2026-00165, due no later than March 26, 2026, limited to addressing whether Petitioner is taking inconsistent claim construction positions between the Petition and the parallel litigation. Patent Owner is authorized to file a 3-page preliminary sur-reply in IPR2026-00165 due no later than March 31, 2026, limited to addressing the same issue.

The parties should file their briefs as papers in P-TACTS.

Regards,

Andrew Kellogg,
Deputy Chief Clerk, Trials
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
USPTO
andrew.kellogg@uspto.gov
(571) 272-5366

1776-2026
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Celebrating 250 years of life, liberty, and the pursuit of innovation

From: Peters, Steven <speters@cgsh.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2026 9:40 AM
To: Director_DI <Director_DI@uspto.gov>
Cc: MLB-Reed-IPR-955 <mlb-reed-ipr-955@morganlewis.com>; Gray IV, Andrew J. <andrew.gray@morganlewis.com>; Bregman, Dion M. <dion.bregman@morganlewis.com>; Restauri, Nicholas A. <nicholas.restauri@morganlewis.com>; Naples, Clement <cnaples@cgsh.com>; Yeh, Thomas W. <tyeh@cgsh.com>; Schnurer, John <john.schnurer@foley.com>
Subject: IPR2026-00165 - Request for Reply to POPR

You don't often get email from speters@cgsh.com. Learn why this is important

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

IPR2026-00165

Dear Director Squires,

Petitioner respectfully requests authorization to file a 2-page Reply to the Patent Owner Preliminary Response in the above proceeding. The scope would be limited to responding to Patent Owner's allegation that Petitioner is taking inconsistent claim construction positions in district court. Petitioner could not have foreseen this argument because (1) patent owner did not make it in its discretionary denial briefing, (2) Petitioner is not advancing any indefiniteness argument in the district court proceedings, and (3) the only construction Petitioner has proposed in the district court is that the preamble of claim 1 should be accorded its plain and ordinary meaning, where the preamble is limiting—which is consistent with Petitioner's position in the IPR Petition.

Petitioner requests a 2-page Reply due 1 week from authorization.

Patent Owner has indicated it will not oppose this request if it is granted a corresponding sur-reply limited to the same issue. Petitioner would not oppose such a 2-page sur-reply.

Respectfully submitted,
Steven Peters
Counsel for Petitioner Monolithic Power Systems, Inc.

Steven Peters
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP
2112 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037
T: +1 202 974 1813
speters@cgsh.com | clearygottlieb.com

This message is being sent from a law firm and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete this message and any attachments without retaining a copy.

Throughout this communication, "Cleary Gottlieb" and the "Firm" refer to Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP and its affiliated firms or entities, and the term "offices" includes offices of those affiliated firms or entities. The term "partner" in relation to Cleary Gottlieb means a member, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications of Cleary Gottlieb.

For information about how the Firm collects and uses your personal data, please see our Privacy Statement.