PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE 1 (REVISION 16)

ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES TO PANELS

This Standard Operating Procedure ("SOP") describes the process by which judges are assigned to panels in all jurisdictions of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board ("PTAB" or "Board"). As used in this SOP, the "jurisdictions" refer to the Board's authority over specific types of proceedings, such as *ex parte* appeals of patent applications ("*ex parte* appeals"), reexamination appeals, reissue appeals, interferences, and America Invents Act ("AIA")[1] proceedings[2,3] (collectively "cases"). Board administrative personnel assign panels of three administrative patent judges ("APJs" or "judges") for thousands of cases across the full range of the Board's jurisdiction. Accordingly, the following guidance is provided to implement the efficient use of the expertise and experience of the APJs, while appropriately balancing APJ workloads and the needs of the Board in relation to all jurisdictions of the Board.

This SOP sets forth internal norms for the administration of the PTAB. It does not create any legally enforceable rights. The actions described in this SOP are part of the United States Patent and Trademark Office's ("USPTO") deliberative process.

---

[1] Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, Pub. L. 112–29, 125 Stat. 284 (Sept. 16, 2011).

[2] AIA proceedings include *inter partes* reviews under 35 U.S.C. § 311; post-grant reviews under 35 U.S.C. § 321; covered business method patent reviews under Leahy-Smith America Invents Act § 18, Pub. L. 112–29, 125 Stat. 284, 329 (Sept. 16, 2011); and derivation proceedings under 35 U.S.C. § 135.

[3] Under § 18 of the AIA, the transitional program for post-grant review of covered business method patents sunset on September 16, 2020. AIA § 18(a).

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 1

I. Delegation of the Director's Authority to the Chief Judge

"Each appeal, derivation proceeding, post-grant review, and *inter partes* review shall be heard by at least 3 members of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, who shall be designated by the Director." 35 U.S.C. § 6. The Director's authority under 35 U.S.C. § 6(c) to designate panels has been delegated to the Chief Judge.[4] The Director will not be involved in directing or otherwise influencing the paneling or repaneling of any specific proceeding before the PTAB prior to the issuance of the panel decision. When reviewing or rehearing an issued panel decision, the Director may direct the proceeding in a manner consistent with Board paneling guidance, through an Order entered into the record.[5]

The Chief Judge further delegates the authority to designate panels, as explained in detail in the next section. The Chief Judge, notwithstanding the delegation, retains the authority to designate panels consistent with the guidelines below.

All actions taken to designate panels under this SOP shall be impartial, and no panel members shall be selected to influence an outcome.

II. Further Delegation of the Authority of the Director by the Chief Judge

A. At the direction of the Chief Judge, at least one designated Board employee ("designee") is delegated the task of assigning panels (designations under 35 U.S.C. § 6(c)) for cases in accordance with the Chief Judge's delegation, whose authority derives from the delegated authority of the Director.

B. Employees selected to serve as designees will be notified of their selection.

---

[4] Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 1002.02(f).

[5] PTAB Standard Operating Procedure 4 (SOP4), "Procedure for Pre-Issuance Optional Decision Review and Post-Issuance Decision Review," § IV, available at www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ptab_sop_4-2023-oct.pdf.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 2

C. The delegation to a designee of the task of assigning panels is effective until such time as changed at the direction of the Chief Judge or as otherwise indicated by the Director.

D. The designee(s) will become familiar with the guidance of this SOP and other paneling guidance issued in writing by the Director.

E. The designee(s) will follow the assignment guidelines provided below and as directed by PTAB leadership[6] in accordance with these guidelines. The designee(s) is expected to use best efforts to balance the considerations set forth in these guidelines, such that cases are paneled with judges having appropriate jurisdictional designations, technology disciplines, workload considerations, and docket compositions. The guidelines also strive for a balance of experience levels on panels, while also accounting for the needs of the Board.

F. All actions taken under the authority delegated in this section are subject to review by the Chief Judge in accordance with this guidance.

[6] PTAB leadership comprises the Chief Judge, Deputy Chief Judge, and/or Vice Chief Judges (including those "acting" in these roles).

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 3

III. Guidelines for Paneling *Ex Parte* Appeals, Reexamination Appeals, Reissue Appeals, and AIA Proceedings

A. **Assignment of panels:** The designee(s) shall assign the three judges to serve on a panel as APJ1, APJ2, and APJ3. Panels shall not be expanded beyond three judges. To facilitate the equal balancing of workloads among judges, it is expected that ordinarily, so long as APJ1 is in the majority, APJ1 will do a significant portion of the writing, including any significant writing assignments (as described in the numbered list below), and case management for a case, in consultation with APJ2 and APJ3. Notwithstanding these provisions, any of the three APJs assigned to a case may draft written work product in the case, including concurrences and dissents, and all three APJs provide input on significant writing assignments except in rare circumstances in which fewer than all three APJs are available and in which there is no statutory requirement for a three-APJ panel.

1. Significant writing assignments in *ex parte* appeals include appeals from reissue applications and appeals decisions pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(a).

2. Significant writing assignments in reexamination appeals include *ex parte* reexamination appeals decisions pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 134(b) and *inter partes* reexamination appeals decisions pursuant to pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 134(b) and/or (c).

3. Significant writing assignments in AIA proceedings include decisions on institution ("DIs") pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 314 and 324 and final written decisions ("FWDs") pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 318 and 328.

4. Significant writing assignments for all Board cases may also include decisions on requests for rehearing or decisions on remand from the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, a United States District Court, or the Director.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 4

5. In addition, the Chief Judge may designate other written work products, produced pursuant to the Board's statutory authority, as significant writing assignments, as appropriate for purposes of docket management. See, e.g., 35 U.S.C. § 135 (derivations); pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 135 (interferences).

B. **Avoidance of conflicts of interest and additional paneling instructions regarding financial interests:**

1. In determining whether a conflict of interest exists, the USPTO uses the Judge's "do not panel" list and follows the guidance set forth in the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch at 5 C.F.R. part 2635 ("Ethics Rules")[7] and will consult with the Department of Commerce Ethics Law and Program Office, as necessary, to resolve any questions pertaining to conflicts of interest. A summary of "Ethics guidance" is posted on the USPTO website (www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/ethics-guidance). In addition, the "Guidance on Paneling of Cases" memorandum (the "Paneling Memorandum"), available on the "Resources and guidance" webpage at www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/resources under the "Guidance Memorandum" heading, identifies certain financial interests that may preclude paneling a judge on a case even if those financial interests do not rise to the level of conflicts of interest under Ethics Rules.

[7] Criminal conflict of interest statutes, 18 U.S.C. §§ 201, 203, 205, 208, and 209, are summarized in the appropriate subparts of 5 C.F.R. part 2635 "and must be taken into consideration in determining whether conduct is proper." *See* 5. C.F.R. § 2635.101(c).

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 5

2. Each judge is required to ensure that they comply with the Ethics Rules in all cases, and providing the designee(s) with a "do not panel" list does not excuse judges from the obligation to independently perform conflict checks. Each judge is highly encouraged to provide the designee(s) with a "do not panel" list that identifies financial interests that may preclude paneling them on a case for any reason, and to update that list whenever the judge becomes aware of new financial interests that may preclude paneling them on a case for any reason.

3. Each judge is ultimately responsible for complying with conflict-of-interest rules and the guidance set forth in the Paneling Memorandum, and for informing the designee(s) if re-paneling is needed for a particular case.

4. The designee(s) must not panel a judge on a case if any of the disclosed parties or real parties in interest are entities identified by a judge pursuant to paragraph 2, if the case is identified by a judge pursuant to paragraph 3, or if it otherwise appears that doing so would violate the Ethics Rules for that judge or contravene the guidance set forth in the Paneling Memorandum.

C. **Paneling by jurisdiction designation:** By default, all judges work on *ex parte* appeals. As described further below, some judges are paneled only on *ex parte* appeals, while other judges are also paneled on cases in other jurisdictions of the Board (e.g., reexamination appeals and/or AIA proceedings).

1. Jurisdiction designations are made by PTAB leadership, accounting for, among other things, each judge's designated jurisdictions, the overall docket composition of the Board, and the needs of the Board.

2. The designee(s) maintains current records of each judge's designated jurisdiction(s).

3. The designee(s) should ensure that judges are paneled in accordance with their designated jurisdiction(s). For example,

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 6

the designee(s) should ensure that a judge who is paneled only on *ex parte* appeals is not paneled on cases in other jurisdictions absent contrary direction from PTAB leadership.

D. **Periodic paneling:**

1. For judges paneled only on *ex parte* appeals, the designee(s) will automatically assign *ex parte* appeals to a judge's docket on a regular, periodic basis, with the goal of maintaining a given judge's docket size at a target level. PTAB leadership designates the target level and a maximum number of *ex parte* appeals that can be assigned to a judge according to the needs of the Board. To request additional appeals, up to a designated maximum number of *ex parte* appeals, a judge should contact the designee(s) to request that additional *ex parte* appeals be added to their docket. The judge's supervisor must approve all requests in excess of the designated maximum number.

2. A judge who is to be paneled on cases in other jurisdictions of the Board (e.g., a judge assigned to handle reexamination appeals and/or AIA proceedings) is not automatically paneled on *ex parte* appeals. To request that *ex parte* appeals be added to their docket, a judge should contact the designee(s) to request a certain number of additional *ex parte* appeals, up to a designated maximum, and also notify the judge's supervisor. The judge's supervisor must approve all requests in excess of the designated maximum number.

3. The designee(s) panels AIA proceedings on a regular, periodic basis (usually monthly). Each month, the designee(s) identifies and panels AIA proceedings after a Notice of Filing Date Accorded ("NFDA") is mailed. These cases will have a projected DI statutory due date six months from the NFDA. A FWD has a statutory due date 12 months from the date a DI is issued. In paneling AIA proceedings, the designee(s) accounts for these dates, as well as the dockets of the assigned judges and the needs of the Board, as set forth below.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 7

E. **Paneling by technology:**

1. Each judge has a technology discipline designation(s) in one or more of the following technology disciplines: biotechnology/pharma, business methods, chemical, electrical, mechanical, and design. Based on their background, each judge indicates a primary technology designation and, where appropriate, an additional technology designation(s).

2. The designee(s) should ensure to the maximum extent possible that judges are paneled so as to match the technology discipline of the case to the technology discipline designations of the paneled judges.

3. The designee(s) panels cases according to the technology discipline.

    a. A technology cluster is a group of judges who are paneled together routinely to decide cases in a particular technology discipline. One or more technology clusters encompass each of the technology disciplines listed in section III.E.2 above. There also are clusters for reexamination appeals, design patents, reissue appeals, and interferences.

    b. A case is first assigned to a "master docket" for the technology discipline corresponding to the subject matter of the claims at issue. Master dockets are generally determined based on the USPTO examination classification of the underlying case.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 8

c. The designee(s) assigns each case to a panel of judges having the appropriate technology designations to the maximum extent possible. The designee(s) should attempt to fill a given judge's docket with cases from their primary technology designation. A judge may be assigned to a case of a particular technology discipline if that judge has that particular technology discipline as a primary (or additional) technology discipline designation, as noted in section III.E.1 above.

d. If needs of the Board dictate, a judge may be assigned to a case related to any technology or cluster.

e. The designee(s) will attempt to assign *ex parte* appeals to three judges in the same technology cluster.

f. The designee(s) will assign *ex parte* appeals for design patent applications to panels of APJs in the design cluster whenever feasible.

g. The designee(s) will assign reexamination appeals to panels of APJs in the reexamination cluster whenever feasible.

h. Reissue appeal paneling will occur as stated below whenever feasible.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 9

i. The designee(s) will assign reissue appeals involving rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 251 to panels of APJs in the reissue cluster whenever feasible.

ii. The designee(s) will assign reissue appeals not involving rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 251 to panels of APJs in the technology cluster corresponding to the technology discipline of the case whenever feasible.

iii. The designee(s) will assign a reissue appeal merged with a reexamination appeal to the panel assigned to the corresponding reexamination appeal whenever feasible.

i. The designee(s) will assign interferences to panels of APJs in the interference cluster whenever feasible.

j. The designee(s) will assign AIA proceedings involving design patents, derivation proceedings, covered business method patent reviews, post-grant reviews, interferences, and reexaminations to judges who have been assigned to be paneled on those cases whenever feasible.

F. **Paneling by experience:** The designee(s) will panel judges new to a particular jurisdiction ("new judges") with judges having more experience in that jurisdiction. The designee(s) will not panel new judges on cases with other new judges absent contrary direction from PTAB leadership.

G. **Paneling related cases:**

1. The designee(s) should assign *ex parte* appeals for which there was a prior appeal to the same panel that heard the prior appeal whenever feasible.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 10

a. When a large number of applications are related, additional factors should be considered in paneling appeals for such applications to ensure decision consistency. For instance, a dedicated panel of three judges may be set up to handle such appeals. Such a panel should help ensure decision consistency across a large number of related applications. PTAB leadership is to be consulted when considering such a dedicated panel.

2. For reexamination appeals, to facilitate the efficiency and consistency of results, the designee(s) should assign reexamination appeals challenging the same patent, or involving the same patent owner and involving related subject matter, to the same panel of judges whenever feasible. When a reexamination appeal is based on a patent that is/was also involved in an AIA proceeding, then the designee(s) should assign, whenever feasible, the authoring judge of the DI and/or the FWD or another APJ of the panel in the related AIA proceeding as APJ2/3 in the reexamination appeal, to ensure consistency in the proceedings. Alternatively, when an AIA proceeding is based on a patent that is/was also involved in a reexamination appeal, then the designee(s) should assign, whenever feasible, the authoring judge of significant writing assignments or another APJ of the panel in the related reexamination appeal as APJ2/3 in the AIA proceeding, to ensure consistency in the cases. Such cases should be identified and paneled before paneling reexamination appeals or AIA proceedings not challenging a previously challenged patent, or involving a patent owner and subject matter involved in a previous challenge.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 11

3. For AIA proceedings, to facilitate the efficiency and consistency of results, the designee(s) should assign families of AIA proceedings challenging the same patent, or involving the same patent owner and involving related subject matter, to the fewest total judges as is practicable in view of statutory deadlines and judge workload and availability. Such cases should be identified and paneled prior to paneling cases not related by family.

    a. It is normally preferred, as workloads permit, to panel as APJ1 a judge who is currently paneled as APJ1 on a pending case in the family or who has written decisions on the merits in a previous case within the family. If that is not feasible, then as workloads permit, it is normally preferred to panel as APJ1 a judge who has previously served as APJ2 or APJ3 on a case in the family.

    b. APJ2 and APJ3 should normally be chosen such that cases in the family are paneled with the same three judges if feasible. If it is not feasible to panel each case in a family with the same three judges, some degree of overlap of judges on the panels is preferred to promote consistency.

    c. When paneling new cases in the family, the designee(s) should, where appropriate, seek input from judges currently serving on existing cases in the family regarding the relative ability of those judges to take on more work.

    d. If a family is large (e.g., four or more cases in a month) and is unrelated to another paneled family, the designee(s) should normally assign a panel with at least two judges who, after consideration of the judges' workload, have the availability to author multiple decisions by the projected due dates of the new cases. A judge paneled as APJ1 on a case should also normally be paneled as APJ2/3 on other cases in the family whenever feasible.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 12

e. A new case in which a request for joinder has been filed will include a challenge to the same patent that is the subject of an existing case to which joinder is requested. The new case should normally be assigned to the same panel as the existing case.

f. A new case not involving a request for joinder but challenging a patent challenged in a previous case should normally be assigned to the same panel as the previous case whenever feasible. Otherwise, the panel should include at least one judge from the previous panel if feasible.

g. If a patent challenged in a new case has been challenged in multiple previous cases presided over by different panels, the designee(s) should, when assigning judges to the panel in the new case, account for factors including judge workload, whether the judge has recently been paneled as APJ1 on a case challenging the patent or a related patent, and whether the judge has written a decision on the merits as to the challenged patent or a related patent.

h. The designee(s) should normally panel unrelated small families of cases and stand-alone cases to judges with availability remaining after paneling large families and cases related to existing cases.

H. **Order of handling cases:**

1. The designee(s) assigns *ex parte* appeals to panels in order based on the appeal numbers assigned by the PTAB when the appeals are docketed by the PTAB. Judges are expected to decide *ex parte* appeals generally in the order the appeals are docketed by the PTAB.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 13

2. The designee(s) panels pre-GATT cases, i.e., applications filed prior to June 8, 1995, immediately when received by the PTAB. *Ex parte* appeals for pre-GATT applications are prioritized based on the age of the application rather than the appeal number.

3. The designee(s) prioritizes the assignment of *ex parte* appeals that have been made special, either through a granted petition to make special of the underlying application or any ongoing expedited patent appeal program. The designee(s) panels such prioritized appeals as may occur at a regular interval to help ensure that those appeals are spread across an appropriate number of judges, such that an individual judge has the capacity to decide the prioritized appeals in an expedited manner.

4. The designee(s) panels reexamination and reissue appeals to ensure such cases are decided with special dispatch.

5. The designee(s) panels AIA proceedings in a manner that strives to ensure that all statutory deadlines are met.

I. **Cases with hearings:**

1. Unless the needs of the PTAB require otherwise, the designee(s) panels *ex parte* appeals with hearings with three judges who are paneled on *ex parte* appeals only.

2. The designee(s) should normally panel a case with at least two judges having an official duty location in a USPTO office, but must panel each case with at least one judge serving in a USPTO office absent approval from PTAB leadership. The two judges having an official duty location in an office need not serve in the same office.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 14

J. **Balancing workload:**

1. The designee(s) should assign a judge a designated number of cases as APJ2/3 for each case the designee(s) assigns the judge as APJ1.

2. Judges provide desired relative levels of AIA proceedings and *ex parte* appeal participation to the designee(s). Because significant writing assignments in AIA proceedings (i.e., DIs and FWDs) have statutory due dates, before assigning an AIA proceeding to a judge, the designee(s) must check the existing assignments for that judge to ascertain whether that judge's workload is substantially above or below their target participation level in AIA proceedings. This check can, and should, be performed during multiple stages of the paneling process as appropriate.

3. The designee(s) should take into consideration the number of significant AIA writing assignments a judge has due in the month of, or months surrounding, the expected due date of a DI in a new AIA proceeding to be assigned to the judge.

4. In cases in which a judge presumptively is to receive an APJ1 assignment in an AIA proceeding (e.g., the judge has presided over a previous case challenging the same or a related patent), and the additional case(s) would place the judge significantly over their target participation level, the designee(s) should contact the judge and obtain feedback from the judge regarding their workload before making the assignment.

5. If, after all AIA cases are paneled for a month, a judge's estimated workload for the fiscal year is lower than that of all the other judges, the designee(s) should give that judge priority in paneling AIA proceedings the following month.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 15

K. **Panel changes:**

1. Generally, before a panel has appeared (e.g., in an order, decision, conference call, or hearing), a judge may request removal from a panel for any reason, consistent with the Paneling Memorandum, that the judge, in their sound judgment, determines to be reasonable, or a judge may be repaneled by the designee(s) to meet statutory deadlines or other needs of the PTAB.

2. For all proceedings in which the panel has appeared (e.g., in an order, decision, conference call, or hearing), further panel changes are generally disfavored and expected to be rare, except that panel changes to avoid conflicts of interest and/or to comply with the guidance set forth in the Paneling Memorandum are always permitted.

3. Any panel change shall be made by the designee(s).

4. Reasons why a panel may change are limited to:

    a. RECUSAL—Judges shall recuse themselves for the reasons set forth in section III.B.1 (referring to Ethics Rules).

    b. UNAVAILABILITY—Judges may be unavailable for reasons that include: extended leave (for example, maternity leave, paternity leave, Family and Medical Leave Act leave, sick leave, or annual leave); the death or serious illness of the judge or a family member; a detail assignment within or outside the USPTO; workload changes; the retirement or permanent departure of the judge from the agency; or other reasons of judge unavailability not captured under 3a or 3c of this section that, in using sound judgment, are determined to be reasonable, including reasons consistent with the Paneling Memorandum.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 16

c. CASE MANAGEMENT—Judges may be reassigned for more efficient case management, to meet the PTAB's statutory deadlines, or to meet other jurisdictional needs of the PTAB (and such deadlines or other needs cannot reasonably be met by reassigning cases not having a publicly assigned panel).

5. To request removal from a panel, the judge should contact the designee(s) and copy their supervisor.

6. Generally, a supervisor's approval is required for panel change requests. However, a supervisor's approval is NOT required when a judge requests to be removed for reasons set forth in section III.B.1[8] or to comply with the guidance set forth in the Paneling Memorandum, and the designee(s) shall grant such requests. A panel member may suggest a specific replacement when requesting the substitution of one or more judges who have indicated a need for a panel change. The designee(s) is not obligated to make the suggested panel assignment but will consider the proposed substitute(s) in exercising the duties outlined in this SOP.

7. For proceedings in which the panel has appeared, panel changes made by the designee(s) that result in the substitution of one or more judges must be approved as set forth in section III.L.6 and finally approved by the PTAB leadership or a designated delegate, unless the panel change occurs as a result of the processes described in section L and M below.

    a. If finally approved, the designee(s) will enter or instruct a trial paralegal to enter an order ("Panel Change Order") of the PTAB leadership or a designated delegate into the public record notifying the parties of the panel change.

[8] If the judge is not sure about whether the factual circumstances of their situation create the appearance of a conflict of interest, the judge should consult with a Department of Commerce ethics official at ethicsdivision@doc.gov.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 17

b. The Panel Change Order will identify the new panel and provide the reason for the panel change from the reasons enumerated above (i.e., recusal, unavailability, or case management). Appendix 1 to this SOP provides the format of the Panel Change Order.

8. Panel members may reorder themselves as APJ1, APJ2, and APJ3 at the panel's discretion at any time during a proceeding, without obtaining a supervisor's approval. The panel will notify the designee(s) so the case assignment records may be updated.

L. **Matters related to Director Review:**

1. The Director may delegate Director Review to a panel of the Board ("Delegated Rehearing Panel" or "DRP"). The Director will issue an order delegating review. When the Director delegates Director Review to a DRP, the designee(s) who assigns panels will assign three judges to serve on a DRP from the list of judges eligible to serve on a DRP (convened based on DRP-specific procedures provided elsewhere in public USPTO guidance), consistent with normal internal procedures and applicable guidance and rules. The Board will prepare a DRP panel identification order, with the names of the assigned judges for the DRP, for issuance by PTAB leadership or the designated delegate.

M. **Matters related to review of *ex parte* appeals decisions:**

1. For an *ex parte* appeal, *ex parte* reexamination appeal, or reissue appeal, the Director may convene an Appeals Review Panel ("ARP") to rehear a Board decision or to consider a Board decision on remand from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The members of the ARP are selected by the Director impartially and are selected pursuant to ARP-specific procedures provided elsewhere in public USPTO guidance.

Moskowitz Exhibit 2013,
Medtronic v. Moskowitz IPR2026-00216 p. 18

PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE 1

APPENDIX 1

Panel Change Order

Trials@uspto.gov
[number]
571.272.7822

Paper No.

Entered: [date]

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

XXXXX,
Petitioner

v.

YYYYY,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR/PGR202X-XXXXX
Patent X,XXX,XXX

Before **[INSERT NAME [DEPUTY] [VICE] CHIEF]**, [*Deputy/Vice*] *Chief Administrative Patent Judge.*

PANEL CHANGE ORDER
Conduct of the Proceedings
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

The parties are notified that the panel has changed in the above-referenced proceeding(s). See Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) Standard Operating Procedure 1, Rev. 16. Due to **[insert: recusal, unavailability, or case management]**, Administrative Patent Judge AAAAA replaces Administrative Patent Judge XXXXX on the panel.

Thus, Administrative Patent Judges AAAAA, YYYYY, and ZZZZZ now constitute the panel for consideration of all matters in this proceeding. See PTAB Standard Operating Procedure 1, Rev. 16. All prior decisions and orders remain in effect. The parties may contact the PTAB at Trials@uspto.gov if they have questions.

It is

ORDERED.

IPR/PGR20YY-*****
Patent [NUMBER]

For PETITIONER:

For PATENT OWNER: