

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BEATBOT TECHNOLOGY (USA) CO. LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

ZODIAC POOL SYSTEMS LLC,

Patent Owner.

Case No.: IPR2026-00201

U.S. Patent No. 11,880,207 B2

**PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S BRIEF
REQUESTING THAT INSTITUTION OF THE PETITION
BE DENIED ON DISCRETIONARY GROUNDS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. INSTITUTION IS WARRANTED IN THIS CASE.....	2
A. The March 11, 2026 Memorandum Does Not Support Discretionary Denial Here.....	2
1. Factor 1: Beatbot’s Manufacturing Outside the U.S. Does Not Support Denial	3
2. Factor 2: Patent Owner’s Competing Products Are Not Manufactured in the United States	4
3. Factor 3: Beatbot Is a Small Business That Has Been Sued for Infringement.....	5
B. The Merits of the Petition Are Strong, and the Prior Art Was Not Meaningfully Addressed During Prosecution	6
1. The Absence of Anticipation Grounds Does Not Indicate Weak Merits	7
2. Cui and Knoll Disclose the Required Claim Elements.....	7
3. The Petition Properly Addresses Claim 4	8
4. The Prior Art Was Not Meaningfully “Addressed and Overcome” During Prosecution.....	9
5. The Petition Relies on Four Independent Primary References—Not “Cumulative” Art	11
6. Patent Owner’s “Other Deficiencies” Are Unsubstantiated.....	11
C. Patent Owner’s Remaining Arguments Are Meritless.....	12
1. Petitioner’s Claim Construction Positions Are Consistent	12
2. Petitioner’s Reliance on Expert Testimony Was Appropriate.....	13
3. Patent Owner Has No Settled Expectations.....	15
4. This IPR Is a True Alternative to District Court Litigation	16
5. The RPI’s Patent Application Does Not Support Denial	18
D. The <i>Fintiv</i> Factors Uniformly Favor Institution.....	18
1. Factor 1: The District Court Has Stayed the Litigation	18
2. Factor 2: No Trial Date Exists.....	19

3.	Factor 3: Minimal Investment of Resources	19
4.	Factor 4: The <i>Sotera</i> -Plus Stipulation Eliminates Duplicative Adjudication 19	
5.	Factor 5: Substantially the Same Parties.....	19
6.	Factor 6: The Merits of the Petition Are Strong.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Cambridge Indus. USA, Inc. v. Applied Optoelects., Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00437, Paper 10 (June 26, 2025).....	14
<i>Genius Sports Ltd. v. Sportscast Inc.</i> , IPR2024-01310, Paper 47 (Mar. 13, 2026)	20
<i>iRhythm Techs., Inc. v. Welch Allyn, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00378, Paper 10 (June 6, 2025).....	14
<i>Light & Wonder, Inc. v. Evolution Malta Ltd.</i> , IPR2025-01072, Paper 11 (Oct. 17, 2025) (no strong settled expectations for patents issued in 2020, 2021, and 2023).....	15
<i>Nearmap US, Inc. v. Eagle View Techs.</i> , IPR2024-00716, Paper 9, 14–15, 19 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 9, 2024).....	9
<i>Padagis US LLC v. Neurelis, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00464, Paper 12 (PTAB July 16, 2025)	10
<i>Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Wilus Inst. of Standards & Tech. Inc.</i> , IPR2025-00935, Paper 12 (Sept. 26, 2025).....	15
<i>Spectrum Sols. LLC v. DNA Genotek Inc.</i> , IPR2022-00134, Paper 7 (PTAB June 6, 2022)	10
<i>Toyota Motor Corp. v. AutoConnect Holdings LLC</i> , PGR2025-00041, Paper 9 (Sept. 8, 2025)	19

PETITIONER'S UPDATED EXHIBIT LIST

No.	Exhibit
1001	U.S. Patent No. 11,880,207 B2 (the '207 Patent)
1002	File History of the '207 Patent
1003	Declaration of Dr. Jason A. Janét in Support of Petition
1004	Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Jason A. Janét
1005	CN1540119A (Cui)
1006	DE102007053310A1 (Knoll)
1007	CN101139007A (Fu-007)
1008	U.S. Patent No. 3,321,787 (Myers)
1009	U.S. Patent No. 4,168,557 (Rasch)
1010	Horgan & Toal, Review of Machine Vision Applications in UAVs (2006)
1011	U.S. Pub. 2013/0024025 A1 (Hsu)
1012	U.S. Pub. 2008/0048870 A1 (Laitta)
1013	Joint Claim Construction Hearing Statement and Joint Claim Construction Worksheet, <i>Beatbot Tech. (USA) Co. Ltd. v. Zodiac Pool Sys. LLC</i> , Case No. 3:25-cv-01946 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2026), Dkt. 35
1014	Patent Owner's Opposition to Beatbot's Motion to Stay, <i>Beatbot Tech. (USA) Co. Ltd. v. Zodiac Pool Sys. LLC</i> , Case No. 3:25-cv-01946 (S.D. Cal.), Dkt. 30-1
1015	Page from Fluidra's Corporate Website, www.fluidrausa.com/en/company (captured on April 16, 2026)
1016	Fluidra, S.A. 2025 Annual Report
1017	Photographs of Retail Packaging of the Polaris Freedom SC Cordless Robotic Pool Cleaner
1018	Declaration of Xingdi Li in Support of Petitioner's Response to Patent Owner's Brief Requesting That Institution of The Petition be Denied on Discretionary Grounds

No.	Exhibit
1019	Declaration of Wei Yuan in Support of Petitioner's Response to Patent Owner's Brief Requesting That Institution of The Petition be Denied on Discretionary Grounds
1020	Zodiac Pool Systems LLC's Preliminary Infringement Contentions (served December 9, 2025), <i>Beatbot Tech. (USA) Co. Ltd. v. Zodiac Pool Sys. LLC</i> , No. 3:25-cv-01946 (S.D. Cal.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Contrary to Patent Owner's assertion, this proceeding is uniquely *unsuited* to the application of discretionary denial. When Patent Owner threatened Petitioner with suit, Petitioner promptly initiated judicial proceedings two weeks later. Petitioner initiated this IPR a mere *six months* after learning of the '207 Patent's existence, and a mere *six weeks* after Patent Owner identified the asserted claims.

Patent Owner attempts to support its request for discretionary denial by casting Petitioner as a foreign goliath, when really that is a better characterization of Patent Owner itself. Petitioner (Beatbot) and its real party-in-interest (Xingmai) are collectively a three-year-old startup with fewer than 500 employees and still in pre-IPO funding. Patent Owner (Zodiac) on the other hand is a wholly-owned subsidiary of a 50+ year-old publicly-traded Spanish corporation (Fluidra), with approximately 6,500 employees, operations in 47 countries, and a market cap in excess of \$5 *billion* USD. There is indeed a David and Goliath story here, but it is Beatbot/Xingmai as the scrappy startup that the long-in-the-tooth foreign goliath Zodiac/Fluidra is trying to chase out of the market with patents that should never have been granted.

For all of the background that Patent Owner casts in the wrong light, the details that Patent Owner fails to mention at all are equally as damning to its request. Zodiac emphasizes that Beatbot's pool cleaners are made in China, but fails to mention that its own pool cleaners are made in Malaysia. Zodiac emphasizes that it

competes with Beatbot, but fails to mention that it does not even practice the asserted patents. Zodiac points to boilerplate language in Beatbot’s invalidity contentions that make passing reference to indefiniteness, but fails to mention that the same document shows that Beatbot did not preserve any such indefiniteness positions.

Zodiac’s request is a thin shell of half-truths and omissions that is easily pierced on even a cursory review. The district court already expressed its preference for the Director and the Board to address invalidity when it granted a stay in favor of the IPR proceedings. For these reasons and others discussed below, the Director should decline to exercise discretion to deny institution.

II. INSTITUTION IS WARRANTED IN THIS CASE

A. The March 11, 2026 Memorandum Does Not Support Discretionary Denial Here

Patent Owner, Zodiac Pool Systems LLC (“Zodiac”), devotes the first and longest section of its brief to application of the March 11, 2026 Memorandum, *Additional Discretionary Institution Considerations* (“March 11 Memo”). The March 11 Memo outlines three specific factors for consideration: (1) the extent to which the accused products are manufactured in the United States; (2) the extent to which the patent owner’s competing products are manufactured in the United States; and (3) whether the petitioner is a small business that has been sued for infringement. March 11 Memo at 2. Zodiac alleges that “compelling economic interests” favor denial because it “employs hundreds of people in the U.S.A.” while “the RPI...

manufactures its products in China.” Patent Owner Brief (“POB”) at 3–5. That account is one-sided, and the full record shows these factors favor institution.

1. Factor 1: Beatbot’s Manufacturing Outside the U.S. Does Not Support Denial

The March 11 Memo does not create a blanket bar against IPR petitions filed by companies that manufacture abroad. Rather, its concern is the offensive use of IPRs by large multinational companies—“the most frequent users of IPR and PGR proceedings”—that lack any U.S. manufacturing stake. March 11 Memo at 1.

Petitioner, Beatbot Technology (USA) Co. Ltd. (“Beatbot”), is the opposite of that target. Beatbot is a startup company founded in 2022 that filed this Petition defensively after Patent Owner accused Beatbot of infringement in a July 2025 cease-and-desist letter. Declaration of Xingdi Li (“Li Decl.”) ¶ 4; Declaration of Wei Yuan (“Yuan Decl.”) ¶ 4. Beatbot is not a serial IPR filer wielding the PTAB against domestic innovation, but a small company exercising its statutory right under 35 U.S.C. § 311 to challenge claims asserted against it.

Although final assembly of the accused product occurs abroad, Beatbot maintains a meaningful and growing U.S. commercial presence: a U.S. customer support line; pop-up retail demonstrations in cities including Miami and Scottsdale; sales through Amazon and its U.S.-facing website; and sponsorship of the U.S. SailGP Team. Li Decl. ¶¶ 7–10. Patent Owner’s characterization of Beatbot as a “shell corporation” with no U.S. presence (POB at 3) is factually wrong.

2. Factor 2: Patent Owner's Competing Products Are Not Manufactured in the United States

The Memo's second factor asks whether Patent Owner's competing products are manufactured in the United States. Patent Owner does not engage with that question. *See generally* POB. Instead, Patent Owner contrasts its "623 employees in the United States" (POB at 4; Madrid Decl. (Ex. 2018) ¶ 3) with Beatbot's foreign manufacturing—implying that Zodiac is a domestic manufacturer defending U.S. operations against a foreign challenger. That implication is wrong. Patent Owner's corporate parent, Fluidra, is a Spanish multinational with 6,500 employees, 47 countries of operation, 135 sales offices, and 36 production centers worldwide. Yuan Decl. ¶ 9 (Ex. 1015).

Patent Owner describes no facts as to its own product relevant to this factor. It asserts only that its "Polaris line of pool cleaners" competes with the accused product. POB at 4. A representative example—the Polaris Freedom SC Cordless Robotic Pool Cleaner—is actually manufactured in Malaysia. Yuan Decl. ¶ 11 (Ex. 1017). And Patent Owner admitted in district court that its products do not even practice the '191 Patent. Yuan Decl. ¶ 12 (Ex. 1020 at 6–7).

The Memo aims to protect companies that invest in U.S. manufacturing—not to give one foreign-manufacturing party a tactical edge over another because its corporate parent employs more U.S.-based sales and marketing staff. Where none of the relevant products are U.S.-manufactured, this factor is at best neutral.

3. Factor 3: Beatbot Is a Small Business That Has Been Sued for Infringement

The March 11 Memo also considers “all relevant facts that the parties raise, including the Small Business Administration’s size standards set forth in 13 C.F.R. §§ 121.801 through 121.805 and 37 C.F.R § 1.27(a) that would render a person, business, or nonprofit organization eligible for reduced patent fees,” and “encourages petitioners who are small businesses that have been sued for infringement to identify themselves to assist the Office in understanding how frequently small businesses use IPRs and PGRs to defend against claims of infringement.” March 11 Memo at 1–2.

Beatbot fits squarely within that category. Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.27(a), a “small entity” is a business concern with fewer than 500 employees. Beatbot, including its real parties-in-interest, Xingmai Innovation Technology (Suzhou) Co., Ltd. (“Xingmai”), satisfies that threshold. Li Decl. ¶ 6.

Patent Owner’s contrary arguments miss the mark. Patent Owner points to (i) marketing materials referencing “500+ patents,” “100,000+ customers,” and “2,000+ retail stores” (POB at 5, citing Ex. 2019), and (ii) an approximately “USD 140 million” venture funding round (POB at 5, citing Ex. 2014). Neither speaks to the controlling standard. The Memo pegs the small-business inquiry to the SBA size standards and § 1.27(a), which turn on employee headcount—not patent counts, customer counts, retail partnerships, or capital raised. The \$140 million figure, in

particular, reflects investor capital committed to fund operations, not Beatbot's valuation, revenue, or profit; many venture-backed startups with nine-figure funding rounds remain pre-profitability.

The David-and-Goliath comparison Patent Owner invites is also the reverse of what Patent Owner suggests. Patent Owner highlights its "623 employees in the United States" (POB at 4) without disclosing that Zodiac is a wholly owned subsidiary of Fluidra, S.A. ("Fluidra"), a publicly traded, Spain-headquartered multinational with approximately 6,500 employees worldwide (Yuan Decl. ¶ 9 (Ex. 1015)), a market capitalization of approximately \$5.2 billion USD (Yuan Decl. ¶ 10 (Ex. 1016 at 29)), and numerous subsidiaries across multiple geographic regions (Yuan Decl. ¶ 10 (Ex. 1016 at 53–57)). Beatbot, by contrast, is a roughly three-year-old startup with fewer than 500 employees. Li Decl. ¶¶ 4, 6. The Memo was designed to surface precisely this asymmetry—a small business defending an infringement campaign by a well-resourced patent owner—and it favors institution here.

B. The Merits of the Petition Are Strong, and the Prior Art Was Not Meaningfully Addressed During Prosecution

Patent Owner attacks the Petition's merits on four grounds: (i) the Petition relies on obviousness rather than anticipation; (ii) Fu-007 was "considered" during prosecution; (iii) the primary references Cui and Knoll allegedly "fail to disclose" required claim elements; and (iv) the Petition's treatment of Claim 4 under Ground 3 (Laitta) is an "improper incorporation by reference." POB at 6–7. Each is incorrect.

1. The Absence of Anticipation Grounds Does Not Indicate Weak Merits

Patent Owner argues that “Petitioner's failure to identify any anticipatory art serves as an initial indication of the weaknesses of the Petition’s merits.” POB at 6. This is a non sequitur. Obviousness under § 103 is a fully independent statutory ground. The Petition presents seven independent grounds across three primary references (Petition at 1–2)—not the “seven grounds” Patent Owner uses to suggest weakness (POB at 6). Patent Owner's characterization conflates the number of grounds with their quality. The strength of a petition should be measured by the quality of its obviousness showing—not by the absence of § 102 grounds, and Patent Owner identifies no authority equating an obviousness-only petition with a weak one.

2. Cui and Knoll Disclose the Required Claim Elements

Patent Owner asserts that Cui and Knoll “do not disclose ‘a controller . . . configured to generate, in response to the captured image, at least one control signal to cause movement of the body within the swimming pool to, or away from, the first [object].’” POB at 7. Patent Owner further asserts that Knoll “fails to disclose ‘a filter configured to retain debris.’” *Id.* Both assertions are wrong.

With respect to the controller limitation, the Petition demonstrates at length that Cui's computer 7 processes images from camera 5 and generates pulse signal commands that control the drive of stepper motors 15, thereby causing movement of

the vehicle body toward detected debris — i.e., “to . . . the first object.” Petition at 14–17; Janét ¶¶ 91–99. Knoll's control unit 11 similarly processes image data from camera 6 to determine distance to boundary surface 4, and generates drive-control signals that adjust vehicle movement to maintain spacing from the boundary surface — causing movement both “to” and “away from” the first object. Petition at 61–64; Janét ¶¶ 234–242. Patent Owner's bare assertion to the contrary ignores over ten pages of detailed claim mapping in the Petition and the Janét Declaration.

With respect to the filter limitation, Knoll expressly discloses that its pool cleaning robot includes “a filter device and/or suction device.” Knoll, [0007], [0021]; Petition at 58–59; Janét ¶¶ 225–227. Patent Owner offers no explanation of why Knoll's “filter device” does not satisfy “a filter configured to retain debris.” That is because it does.

These arguments amount to nothing more than conclusory denials that the Petition's detailed analysis exists. They do not demonstrate weakness in the merits.

3. The Petition Properly Addresses Claim 4

Patent Owner argues that the Petition “fails to provide any reasoning on how claim 4 is unpatentable over Laitta” and that the Janét Declaration's analysis constitutes “improper incorporation by reference.” POB at 6–7 (citing *Nearmap US, Inc. v. Eagle View Techs.*, IPR2024-00716, Paper 9, 14–15, 19 (P.T.A.B. Oct. 9, 2024)). This mischaracterizes both the Petition and the cited precedent.

Claim 4 depends from Claim 2 and recites that “the at least one piece of equipment comprises a pool cleaning device.” The Petition's Ground 3 analysis of Claim 2 establishes that Laitta's alert devices constitute "equipment for a swimming pool." Petition at 94–98; Janét ¶¶ 393–407. The additional element of Claim 4—that the equipment “comprises a pool cleaning device”—is addressed in Dr. Janét's Declaration at ¶¶ 408–410, which provides independent technical analysis of why a POSITA would understand Laitta's system in this context.

Nearmap is distinguishable. There, the Board declined to sift through an expert declaration to locate arguments that the petition itself failed to present. Here, the Petition identifies Claim 4 as challenged under Ground 3 (Petition at 1–2), provides the full Claim 2 analysis upon which Claim 4 depends (Petition at 93–98), and cites Dr. Janét's Declaration for the narrow incremental element of the dependent claim. This is not a case of hiding arguments in a declaration—it is a proper use of expert testimony to support a clearly articulated ground of unpatentability.

4. The Prior Art Was Not Meaningfully “Addressed and Overcome” During Prosecution

Patent Owner contends that “the Patent Office already considered Fu-007 during prosecution.” POB at 6. The record shows otherwise. The '207 Patent issued from U.S. Application No. 17/572,388. The Examiner first issued a Non-Final Office Action rejecting the sole pending Claim 20 for nonstatutory double patenting. EX1002 at 82–90. Applicant then filed a terminal disclaimer and added new Claims

21–39, which the Examiner allowed. EX1002 at 92–105; see Notice of Allowability stating the “allowed claim(s) is/are 20–39.” EX1002 at 146–148. Those application claims later issued as the ’207 Patent’s Claims 1–20. No § 102 or § 103 rejection was ever issued against the allowed claims. POB at 6.

Moreover, Fu-007 was listed in an IDS, but the Examiner never mentioned, analyzed, or applied it to any claim during prosecution of the ’207 Patent or its priority chain. EX1002 at 55, 72. This is the paradigm case of examiner error warranting institution. As the Board has recognized, material error during examination—particularly an examiner’s failure to apply highly relevant prior art—renders discretionary denial inappropriate. *See Padagis US LLC v. Neurelis, Inc.*, IPR2025-00464, Paper 12 at 3 (PTAB July 16, 2025) (informative); *Spectrum Sols. LLC v. DNA Genotek Inc.*, IPR2022-00134, Paper 7 at 13 (PTAB June 6, 2022) (granting institution “[g]iven the simple nature of [the examiner] error (not applying a known anticipatory prior art reference), and the strength of the anticipation showing in the Petition”). Nor is Fu-007 cumulative of the prosecution record. The Petition uses Fu-007 only in specific § 103 combinations with Cui and Knoll, and in combinations with Hsu—combinations the Examiner never considered—supported by expert testimony the Examiner never had. Petition at 1–2.

5. The Petition Relies on Four Independent Primary References—Not “Cumulative” Art

Patent Owner attempts to create the impression that the Petition is narrowly built on Fu-007—a reference it claims was “already considered.” POB at 6. This misrepresents the scope of the Petition. The Petition presents seven grounds of obviousness across three independent primary references (Cui, Knoll, and Laitta). Petition at 1–2. Critically, Ground 2A (Knoll) and Ground 3 (Laitta) are standalone grounds that do not rely on Fu-007 at all. Neither Knoll nor Laitta was cited, discussed, or considered during the prosecution of any member of the ’207 Patent family. It is impossible for Patent Owner to characterize Knoll and Laitta as “the same or cumulative of art addressed and overcome during prosecution” when the Examiner never saw them. Unable to make such a characterization, Patent Owner ignores these grounds entirely in its request.

6. Patent Owner’s “Other Deficiencies” Are Unsubstantiated

Patent Owner states that “[t]he other references have further deficiencies, which will be discussed in more detail in Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response.” POB at 7. This is not an argument—it is a placeholder. The merits should be evaluated based on what Patent Owner has actually articulated, not on the promise of future contentions. Moreover, Patent Owner stopped its argument six pages short in the request, and so certainly had—but did not use—the opportunity to explain the supposed deficiencies in these additional grounds.

C. Patent Owner’s Remaining Arguments Are Meritless

Patent Owner further argues—inconsistent claim construction positions, heavy reliance on expert testimony, settled expectations, and the contention that IPR is not a “true alternative.” POB at 8–15. Each of these is either factually incorrect, legally unsupported, or both.

1. Petitioner’s Claim Construction Positions Are Consistent

Patent Owner argues that Petitioner “takes inconsistent claim construction positions regarding the scope of the Challenged Claims” by seeking broad constructions at the PTAB while “arguing that several terms are indefinite under § 112 in the District Court.” POB at 7–9 (citing Ex. 2005 at 14). This argument is misleading, and Patent Owner knew it was misleading when it filed its brief.

In its Petition, Petitioner stated that “no constructions are necessary except for the means-plus-function (MPF) limitation.” Petition at 5. In the District Court, the parties filed a Joint Claim Construction Hearing Statement and Joint Claim Construction Worksheet on March 23, 2026—one week *before* Patent Owner filed its brief, confirming that “[t]he Parties identified one term for construction, and the Parties reached an agreed construction for that term.” Yuan Decl. ¶ 6 (Ex. 1013 at 2). The single term the parties agreed upon is the means-plus-function limitation—the same and only term Petitioner identified for construction in its Petition. *Id.* There is no inconsistency; Petitioner’s IPR position (only the MPF term requires

construction) is identical to its District Court position. *Compare* Petition at 5 with Ex. 1013 at 2. Patent Owner was a signatory to the Joint Statement, and therefore knew that Petitioner’s claim construction positions are consistent when it filed its brief on March 30, 2026. Patent Owner’s characterization of an inconsistency is not merely wrong; it is a misrepresentation.

Moreover, Patent Owner’s reliance on the boilerplate § 112 language in Beatbot’s Preliminary Invalidity Contentions (Ex. 2005 at 14) is equally misleading. Beatbot served its Preliminary Invalidity Contentions before the proposed claim construction, and the passage Patent Owner quotes is standard reservation-of-rights language preserving Beatbot’s right to assert § 112 defenses based on claim constructions that may later be adopted. Beatbot’s invalidity contentions do not assert any actual § 112(b) indefiniteness ground. *See* Ex. 2005 at 27–29. Thus in the only two places that Beatbot could have presented actual indefiniteness positions, it did not do so. A fact that Patent Owner was fully aware of, but apparently did not consider worth bringing to the Director’s attention.

2. Petitioner’s Reliance on Expert Testimony Was Appropriate

Patent Owner argues that Petitioner’s “extremely long declaration presents a text-book case of over-reliance on an expert” because “large swaths of the Petition are identical copy-and-paste from Dr. Janét’s purported testimony.” POB at 8–10. This argument fails as a matter of law and fact.

As a matter of law, since the March 2025 Interim Processes Memo, reliance on expert testimony has favored discretionary denial only where unsupported expert testimony was offered to fill gaps in the prior art—not because a petition and declaration are similar. *See, e.g., iRhythm Techs., Inc. v. Welch Allyn, Inc.*, IPR2025-00378, Paper 10 at 2–3 (June 6, 2025) (rejecting assertion that petitioner is “over-reliant on expert testimony” when nothing “suggest[s] Petitioner is using its expert to fill gaps in the prior art”); *Cambridge Indus. USA, Inc. v. Applied Optoelects., Inc.*, IPR2025-00437, Paper 10 at 2 (June 26, 2025) (same). Patent Owner has not identified a single instance where Dr. Janét’s testimony was used to fill gaps in the prior art rather than to explain and apply the references.

Patent Owner’s comparison chart (Ex. 2021) is itself misleading. Patent Owner’s chart omits more than 40 pages of expert analysis, including Dr. Janét’s definition of a POSITA, his explanation of relevant legal standards, his overview of the technology and its historical development, his walkthrough of the ’207 Patent, and his analysis of the prosecution history, priority date, and claim construction. *See, e.g., Janét Decl.* ¶¶ 28–49, 60–96. Patent Owner characterizes these omissions as “non-substantive” or “identical”—but the omitted material includes Dr. Janét’s independent technical conclusions on the most contested issues in this proceeding, including the priority-date analysis on which the Petition’s prior-art case depends.

Moreover, the decisions Patent Owner cites do not support its argument. Each predates bifurcated review, involved the Board’s merits evaluation at institution, and discounted the proffered testimony because it was conclusory and filled gaps in the prior art—not because the testimony resembled the petition.

3. Patent Owner Has No Settled Expectations

Patent Owner argues that “[s]ettled expectations weigh in favor of denial” based on (i) Petitioner’s awareness of the Challenged Patent for “over six months” and (ii) the age of the patent family. POB at 10–12. Neither argument has merit.

The ’207 Patent issued on January 23, 2024. It is less than three years old. Patent Owner has no settled expectations regarding a patent of this youth. As the Director has repeatedly recognized, early challenges to young patents favor robust, predictable patent rights and weigh against discretionary denial. *See Light & Wonder, Inc. v. Evolution Malta Ltd.*, IPR2025-01072, Paper 11 at 2 (Oct. 17, 2025) (no strong settled expectations for patents issued in 2020, 2021, and 2023); *see also Samsung Elecs. Co. v. Wilus Inst. of Standards & Tech. Inc.*, IPR2025-00935, Paper 12 at 2–3 (Sept. 26, 2025).

Patent Owner’s reliance on Petitioner’s “six months” of awareness is unavailing. Petitioner received Patent Owner’s cease-and-desist letter on July 17, 2025, filed a declaratory judgment action two weeks later, and filed this Petition on January 26, 2026—just six weeks after Patent Owner served its preliminary

infringement contentions. Ex. 2024 at 6; Yuan Decl. ¶ 12 (Ex. 1020). Indeed, the District Court considered Patent Owner’s identical “delay” argument in the parallel litigation and expressly rejected it, finding that Petitioner’s “delay in filing petitions for IPR is not as great as [Defendant] suggests.” *Id.* That chronology reflects prompt defensive action at every stage, not the long-standing, business-building reliance on a patent’s existence that the settled-expectations doctrine targets.

Patent Owner’s reliance on the patent family’s age fares no better. Patent Owner argues that “family members first issued nearly a decade ago.” POB at 12. But the relevant inquiry is the age of the challenged patent. Each patent in a family has its own claims and its own validity, and the ’207 Patent issued in 2022 with claims that were never substantively examined against prior art. *See* § II.B.3, *supra*. Patent Owner cannot bootstrap settled expectations from an older family member to shield a young patent whose claims were allowed through examiner error.

4. This IPR Is a True Alternative to District Court Litigation

Patent Owner argues that “Petitioner’s conduct to date suggests that IPR is not a true alternative to District Court litigation.” POB at 12–13. This argument is contradicted by the record—and, remarkably, by Patent Owner’s own prior representations to the District Court.

Patent Owner first faulted Petitioner for not filing a *Sotera* stipulation. In opposing Beatbot’s motion to stay, Patent Owner argued: “Beatbot has not filed a

Sotera stipulation in support of its IPR petitions . . . In not agreeing to refrain from such challenges, Beatbot indicates to both the PTAB and to this Court that other invalidity grounds (or the same specific grounds) may—or will—be brought in this action, undermining any claim of simplification.” Yuan Decl. ¶ 7 (Ex. 1014 at 6–7). Petitioner then filed a *Sotera*-plus stipulation, expressly agreeing not to advance in the District Court “(i) the specific grounds raised in the IPRs; (ii) any other grounds that could have reasonably been raised before the PTAB (i.e., any 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 or 103 grounds based on prior art patents or printed publications); or (iii) any ground based on a combination of system prior art and the prior art patents or printed publications described in (i) or (ii).” Paper 6; Ex. 2024 at 4. Patent Owner now asks the Director to “discount” the very stipulation it told the District Court was essential. POB at 13.

The District Court agreed with Petitioner and stayed the litigation pending these IPR proceedings. Ex. 2024 at 12. That ruling is powerful confirmation that this IPR is a meaningful and potentially dispositive proceeding—the opposite of Patent Owner’s “not a true alternative” position. With the litigation now stayed, there is no risk of duplicative proceedings; the IPR is the only currently active invalidity forum.

Patent Owner’s remaining grounds for “discounting” the stipulation also fail. Patent Owner points to Petitioner’s § 101 motion for judgment on the pleadings and to boilerplate § 112 language in Petitioner’s invalidity contentions. POB at 13.

Patent Owner would require a petitioner to waive patent eligibility challenges that the PTAB cannot adjudicate, and that is not the law. The District Court denied the § 101 motion without prejudice precisely because “if IPRs are instituted, the decision of the PTAB could simplify the issues presently before the Court in Plaintiffs’ Motion to Dismiss.” Ex. 2024 at 12–13. The court is deferring to this proceeding, not running parallel to it. As to § 112, Petitioner has not asserted any actual indefiniteness invalidity positions. *See* §II.C.1, *supra*.

5. The RPI’s Patent Application Does Not Support Denial

Patent Owner argues that because the RPI, Xingmai, is prosecuting a patent application with claims of allegedly “similar scope” to the challenged patent, this “weighs in favor of discretionary denial.” POB at 13–14. This argument is a non sequitur. The fact that Xingmai is seeking its own patent for pool robot technology does not present inconsistencies. It reflects the normal operation of the patent system, and each patent must independently satisfy the requirements of patentability.

D. The *Fintiv* Factors Uniformly Favor Institution

Patent Owner conspicuously declined to address the *Fintiv* factors in its brief. The reason is apparent: the factors weigh strongly against discretionary denial.

1. Factor 1: The District Court Has Stayed the Litigation

The District Court stayed the litigation in the Southern District of California pending these IPR proceedings. Ex. 2024. This factor weighs strongly against discretionary denial.

2. Factor 2: No Trial Date Exists

With the litigation stayed, there is no trial date. There is thus no risk that the district court trial will precede the Final Written Decision—there is no trial to precede it. This factor also weighs strongly against discretionary denial.

3. Factor 3: Minimal Investment of Resources

The district court case is in its early stages. Ex. 2024 at 6. The parties exchanged infringement and invalidity contentions. The parties reached an agreed construction on the single term at issue and requested that the court vacate all other claim construction proceedings. *Id.* No expert reports have been served, and no depositions have been taken. *Id.* This factor weighs against discretionary denial.

4. Factor 4: The *Sotera-Plus* Stipulation Eliminates Duplicative Adjudication

As discussed above, Petitioner filed *Sotera-plus* stipulation (Paper 6). There will be no duplicative adjudication of the issues presented in this Petition. This factor weighs strongly against discretionary denial. *See Toyota Motor Corp. v. AutoConnect Holdings LLC*, PGR2025-00041, Paper 9 at 3 (Sept. 8, 2025).

5. Factor 5: Substantially the Same Parties

Beatbot is the Petitioner and the district court plaintiff/counterclaim-defendant. Zodiac is the Patent Owner and the district court defendant/counterclaim-plaintiff. The overlap of parties is complete, and thus this factor is neutral.

6. Factor 6: The Merits of the Petition Are Strong

The Petition presents six grounds of obviousness under § 103 across four independent primary references. Petition at 6. Patent Owner's entire merits defense is conclusory and fails to engage with the substance of the prior art. *See Genius Sports Ltd. v. Sportscaster Inc.*, IPR2024-01310, Paper 47 (Mar. 13, 2026) (conclusory assertions do not create a dispute over patentability). This factor weighs strongly in favor of institution.

* * *

In sum, every *Fintiv* factor either weighs against discretionary denial or is neutral. Patent Owner's decision not to address *Fintiv* was a strategic concession because it had nothing favorable to say.

Dated: April 28, 2026

PERKINS COIE LLP
11452 El Camino Real, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130

Respectfully submitted,

/ Kyle R. Canavera /

Lead Counsel

Kyle R. Canavera, Reg. No. 72,167

Back-up Counsel

Wei Yuan, Reg. No. 71,772

Xiaobing Zhang, Reg. No. 63,929

Bing Ai, Reg. No. 43,312

Babak Tehranchi, Reg. No. 55,937

Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that true copies of the foregoing PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO PATENT OWNER'S BRIEF REQUESTING THAT INSTITUTION OF THE PETITION BE DENIED ON DISCRETIONARY GROUNDS and associated exhibits have been served on Patent Owner at the following address:

Michael T. Morlock, mmorlock@ktslaw.com
Christopher S. Leah, cleah@ktslaw.com

Dated: April 28, 2026

By: /Meghan Bright/
Meghan Bright
Paralegal