

IPR2026-00233 (Patent 11,656,067)
Opposition to Request for Director Review

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

KLEIN TOOLS, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

MILWAUKEE ELECTRIC TOOL CORPORATION,

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2026-00233

U.S. Patent No. 11,656,067

**OPPOSITION TO PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR
DIRECTOR REVIEW**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Background	3
	A. IPR2026-00246 Challenged Unrelated U.S. Patent No. 11,857,064	3
	B. No Valid Parallel Litigation Exists	4
III.	Institution Creates No Inefficiencies.....	6
	A. The Unrelated Patent Is Not Proceeding in a Parallel Forum, Eliminating any Purported Risk of Inefficiencies or Inconsistencies.....	6
	B. The Director’s Decision in IPR2026-00246 Is Unrelated to this Petition.....	7
IV.	Milwaukee’s Disagreement with the Director’s exercise of Discretion Under <i>Revvo</i> Does Not Warrant Vacatur	10
V.	Milwaukee’s Disagreement with the Director’s Merits Analysis Does Not Warrant Vacatur.....	13
VI.	Conclusion	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES¹

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.</i> , 576 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2009)	14
<i>Cochlear Bone Anchored Sols. AB v. Oticon Med. AB</i> , 958 F.3d 1348 (Fed. Cir. 2020)	11
<i>Light & Wonder, Inc. v. Evolution Malta Ltd.</i> , IPR2025-01072, Paper 30, Order (June 22, 2026)	9
<i>OnePlus Tech. (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd. v. Pantech Corp.</i> , IPR2025-00720, Paper 11, Director Decision (Oct. 3, 2025)	2, 10
<i>Terumo BCT, Inc. v. Haemonetics Corp.</i> , IPR2025-01374, Paper 20 (May 12, 2026).....	9, 12
<i>Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC</i> , IPR2025-00340, Paper 18, Order (Nov. 5, 2025).....	12
<i>TikTok, Inc. v. Shopsee, Inc.</i> , IPR2025-01485, Paper 13 (Jan. 16, 2026).....	9
<i>Zhuhai CosMx Battery Co., Ltd. v. Ningde Ampere Tech. Ltd.</i> , IPR2025-00524, Paper 10, Director Decision (Sept. 3, 2025)	2, 10
Rules	
Rule 42.104(b)(3).....	12
Other Authorities	
MPEP § 2163.07(b).....	14

¹ All emphasis added unless otherwise noted.

LIST OF EXHIBITS²

Exhibit No.	Description
1001	Certified U.S. Patent No. 11,656,067
1002	Certified File History for U.S. Patent No. 11,656,067
1003	Declaration of Robert Giachetti
1004	<i>Curriculum Vitae</i> of Robert Giachetti
1005	U.S. Patent No. 7,096,596 (“Hernandez”)
1006	U.S. Patent No. 6,324,769 (“Murray”)
1007	U.S. Patent No. 6,367,161
1008	U.S. Patent No. 6,662,463
1009	U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0071869 (filed Oct. 10, 2002) (“Gilliam”)
1010	U.S. Patent No. 4,429,462
1011	U.S. Patent No. 6,243,964
1012	U.S. Patent No. 6,282,808
1013	U.S. Patent No. 6,643,947
1014	U.S. Patent No. 6,804,899
1015	Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response to Petition, <i>Apex Tool Group LLC v. Milwaukee Electric Tool Corp.</i> , PGR2020-00056, Paper No. 9

² Descriptions are for convenience only and are not admissions or evidence.

IPR2026-00233 (Patent 11,656,067)
Opposition to Request for Director Review

Exhibit No.	Description
1016	Milwaukee Tool Internal May 8, 2017 Presentation, titled “Wider tape standout issue[:] Root cause analysis and Rework”
1017	Milwaukee Tool Internal Standout Procedure Excel Spreadsheet
1018	Kat Eschner, <i>How Hoop Skirts Led to Tape Measures</i> , Smithsonian Magazine (July 14, 2017), https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/how-hoop-skirts-led-tape-measures-180963995/ (last visited Dec. 5, 2025)
1019	Tape (Chesterman), https://americanhistory.si.edu/collections/object/nmah_761653
1020	U.S. Patent No. 79,965
1021	U.S. Patent No. 1,402,589
1022	Dkt. 28, Report of the Parties’ Planning Meeting in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1023	Dkt. 30, Order adopting Parties’ Proposed Case Management Schedule in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1024	Dkt. 42, Order granting Joint Motion for Extension of Certain Dates in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1025	Dkt. 53, Joint Motion to Extend Certain Deadlines in the Scheduling Order in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1026	Declaration of Nathaniel Louis DeLucia in Support of Admission <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>
1027	Declaration of Ryan Kane

IPR2026-00233 (Patent 11,656,067)
Opposition to Request for Director Review

Exhibit No.	Description
1028	Dkt. 68, Joint Status Report in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1029	Dkt. 70, Plaintiff's Opposed Motion for Voluntary Dismissal of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint Without Prejudice and Dismissal of Defendant's Counterclaims Without Prejudice in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1030	Dkt. 72, Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Opposed Motion for Voluntary Dismissal of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint Without Prejudice and Dismissal of Defendant's Counterclaims Without Prejudice in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1031	Dkt. 76, Minute Entry Assigning Case Back to District Judge in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1032	March 6, 2026 Response Letter from J. White to R. Kane in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tools Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)
1033	<i>Case Study: Milwaukee Tool</i> , Tariff Integrity, https://www.tariffintegrity.org/tti/milwaukeeetool (last visited April 14, 2026)
1034	<i>Chinese-owned power tool company based in Wisconsin targeted by Trump administration for tariff evasion</i> , Washington Examiner (February 12, 2026), https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/white-house/4454169/trump-administration-action-chinese-owned-company-wisconsin/ (last visited April 29, 2026)
1035	<i>American Manufacturing</i> , Klein Tools, https://www.kleintools.com/content/american-manufacturing (last visited April 14, 2026)

IPR2026-00233 (Patent 11,656,067)
Opposition to Request for Director Review

Exhibit No.	Description
1036	Techtronic Industries 2025 Annual Report (excerpted)
1037	Dkt. 78, Klein Tools' Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Voluntary Dismissal of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint Without Prejudice and Dismissal of Defendant's Counterclaims Without Prejudice and Request for Sanctions in <i>Milwaukee Electric Tool Corporation v. Klein Tools, Inc.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-04689 (N.D. Ill.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Milwaukee bases its Request for Director Review on two fundamentally flawed assertions. *First*, Milwaukee argues that a pending parallel district court case will result in “fragmentation,” “inefficiency,” and “conflicting” determinations due to the grant of institution on the challenged patent, *i.e.*, U.S. Patent No. 11,656,067 (“’067 Patent”) and the denial of institution on U.S. Patent No. 11,857,064 (“the Unrelated Patent”). Paper 16 (“DR Br.”) at 1–2. *Second*, Milwaukee asserts these two patents are so related that they cannot be adjudicated separately, complaining the Director granted institution “without explain[ation],” suggesting he lacked “a reasoned basis” to exercise such discretion. Both assertions are false. *Id.* at 1, 7. Milwaukee’s remaining arguments simply re-raise (and in some cases re-re-raise) already rejected arguments without any change in facts or circumstances. Milwaukee is wrong, and the Director should once again reject Milwaukee’s arguments.

Milwaukee’s “fragmentation,” “inefficiency” and “inconsistency” arguments fail from the get-go: no district court is considering the validity of either patent in parallel. Milwaukee has moved to dismiss the district court case it points to because Milwaukee had *no rights* in the patents when it sued Klein (“the To-Be-Dismissed Case”). Because Milwaukee lacked constitutional standing, the case will be dismissed, the district court vacated all deadlines, and the only issue pending is what conditions or sanctions Milwaukee will face upon dismissal. Milwaukee’s

suggestion there will be fragmentation based on the To-Be-Dismissed Case is fiction.

Further, Milwaukee's view that because it asserted the '067 Patent together with the Unrelated Patent in the To-Be-Dismissed Case last year, the Director must explain why he instituted IPR for one but not the other makes no sense. The Director does not lose discretion to evaluate each petition on its merits simply because Milwaukee asserted two unrelated patents in a prior proceeding.

That discretion is particularly important here because the patents, prior art, and issues are distinct. The Unrelated Patent claims a detachable tool pouch, not a tape measure; shares no named inventors with the '067 Patent; involves different accused products; and Klein challenged it based on different prior art raising unique claim construction issues not present here. Determining validity of the '067 Patent here and the Unrelated Patent in a different forum cannot give rise to inconsistencies given the lack of overlapping issues. The Director has previously exercised discretion to deny institution for some but not other IPR petitions in similar circumstances. *OnePlus Tech. (Shenzhen) Co., Ltd. v. Pantech Corp.*, IPR2025-00720, Paper 11, Director Decision (Oct. 3, 2025) (denying institution for three of four patents asserted in parallel litigation but declining to deny for fourth "unrelated" patent); *Zhuhai CosMx Battery Co., Ltd. v. Ningde Amperex Tech. Ltd.*, IPR2025-00524, Paper 10, Director Decision (Sept. 3, 2025) (denying one petition while referring another to Board based on differing circumstances). Contrary to

Milwaukee's arguments (DR Br. at 2, 5), the Director's discretion to make different decisions in different IPRs based on their differing circumstances serves the Office's important policy goals.

The remainder of Milwaukee's Request relitigates the *Revvo* and merits arguments it raised in its POPR, which the Director already considered. As Klein previously explained, Klein's claim construction positions in the Petition are entirely consistent with the positions it took in the To-Be-Dismissed Case, and the strength of the Petition speaks for itself. The Director already considered Milwaukee's arguments, and Klein's responses, and declined to discretionarily deny institution. Milwaukee has provided no reason to revisit that decision. Milwaukee's Request should be denied.

II. BACKGROUND

A. IPR2026-00246 Challenged Unrelated U.S. Patent No. 11,857,064

The Unrelated Patent claims a tool pouch that detachably connects to a user's belt. IPR2026-00246, Paper 2 at 1. It purports to claim the benefit of and priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 62/804,547, filed on Feb. 12, 2019. IPR2026-00246, Paper 2 at 7; *Id.*, Ex-1001 at cover. It does not claim priority to the '067 Patent or any of its family members. *Id.* The Unrelated Patent does not share any inventors with the '067 Patent. *Id.*, Ex-1001 at cover. In the To-Be-Dismissed Case, Milwaukee accused tape measures of infringing the '067 Patent; Milwaukee accused

tool pouches of infringing the Unrelated Patent. Klein filed a petition on the Unrelated Patent in January, and it was discretionarily denied on July 6, 2026. IPR2026-00246, Paper 13. There is no overlapping prior art between the Petitions.

B. No Valid Parallel Litigation Exists

Milwaukee filed the To-Be-Dismissed Case on April 29, 2025, alleging that Klein infringed claim 1 of the '067 Patent and pleading that it “own[ed] by assignment all rights, title, and interests in and to ... the '067 Patent.” Ex-1037 at 11. Milwaukee filed an Amended Complaint on May 6, 2025, adding claims 1 and 16 of the Unrelated Patent and repeating the same ownership representation. *Id.* During the litigation, Klein uncovered that Milwaukee knew that the sole allegedly inventive feature of the Challenged Claims, *i.e.*, standout over 150 inches, already existed in the prior art before the '067 Patent's earliest possible priority date. *Id.* at 12–13; Pet. at 1–2; Ex-1017 (Patent Owner testing conducted before the '067 Patent's earliest possible priority date showing the Stanley FatMax 33502 and Dewalt 33924 had standout greater than 150 inches (12.5 feet)). Klein filed its First Amended Answer and Counterclaims on January 22, 2026, alleging that the asserted claims³ were

³ Milwaukee repeats its misstatement that Klein “counterclaim[ed] for declaratory judgment of invalidity of all claims of the '067 [and '064] Patent[s],” likely to incorrectly suggest an overlap of issues with the To-Be-Dismissed Case. DR Br. at

invalid, and that the '067 patent inventors and their prosecution counsel committed inequitable conduct by withholding this information from the Patent Office.

Days after Klein filed its counterclaim, Milwaukee “discovered” it did not possess any rights to the '067 or the Unrelated Patent and indicated that it intended to move to dismiss the case for lack of standing. Ex-1028. Milwaukee also took the position that because it sued on patents it did not own, it was not bound by the scope or history of the To-Be-Dismissed Case, intending to file additional claims and patents in any new case and disagreed that the scope of the litigation would remain the same. Ex-1032 at 2–3; Ex-1037 at 13–14, 20. Milwaukee filed its motion to dismiss in March 2026. Ex-1029. Klein responded and sought conditions or sanctions on dismissal given Milwaukee’s egregious conduct and its attempt to pass the cost of its wrongdoing onto Klein. Ex-1037 at 8–9, 16. The case ***will be dismissed*** and all deadlines were vacated while the Court considers the only remaining issue: whether the eventual dismissal will come with conditions or sanctions on Milwaukee. *Id.*; *see also id.* at 16–22; Ex-1028 at 4; Ex-1031 (vacating all deadlines).

3. As Klein has repeatedly stated, Klein only pursued invalidity of the asserted claims in district court. Paper 11 at 7 (correcting Milwaukee when it made the same argument in its discretionary brief); Ex-1037 at 19 (correcting Milwaukee when it made the same argument in the To-Be-Dismissed Case).

III. INSTITUTION CREATES NO INEFFICIENCIES

The Board will serve as an efficient forum for the '067 Patent, not a duplicative one. Milwaukee argues the Director erred in exercising discretion to institute this proceeding because it purportedly divides “one district court dispute between forums,” creating “the risk of conflicting outcomes.” DR Br. at 6. Milwaukee is wrong for two independent reasons. *First*, there is no valid “district court dispute”; that case will be dismissed and all deadlines have been vacated since March pending dismissal. No new case has been filed, and it is speculation whether, or even if, such a case may be filed. *Second*, Milwaukee provides no explanation how proceeding in district court on the Unrelated Patent creates inefficiencies given it is in a completely different patent family, involving different technology, and different prior art than the '067 Patent.

A. The Unrelated Patent Is Not Proceeding in a Parallel Forum, Eliminating any Purported Risk of Inefficiencies or Inconsistencies

Milwaukee's suggestion that the To-Be-Dismissed Case is ongoing because there has not been “a dismissal order” is disingenuous. DR Br. at 3, 11. Milwaukee was forced to move to dismiss because it lacked constitutional standing; the Court vacated all deadlines, and the only pending issue is what conditions or sanctions Milwaukee will face upon dismissal. Ex-1031; Ex-1037 at 11–14; §II.B. The alleged inefficiency—that the Board will decide the '067 Patent's validity “while the district

court remains the forum for the '064 Patent, infringement, indefiniteness, and other issues”—is fiction: no valid district court forum currently exists.

While Milwaukee attempts to downplay this by alleging it “inten[ds] to refile,” Milwaukee identifies no authority suggesting hypothetical inefficiencies from *hypothetical future litigation* warrant vacating an Institution Decision. DR Br. at 11. And to the extent Milwaukee suggests any new case will simply “reus[e] the parties’ work,” picking up where the To-Be-Dismissed case left off, this too invites the Director to believe a fiction. DR Br. at 11. Milwaukee represented that should it refile, it intends to assert additional claims, accuse additional products, and add additional patents, such that any new case would bear little resemblance to the To-Be-Dismissed Case. Ex-1032 at 2–3; Ex-1037 at 13–14. Any new case would likely be stayed in any event, at least with respect to the '067 Patent, given Institution, such that the Board would remain the sole forum considering the '067 Patent’s validity.

At bottom, only one forum is considering the '067 Patent’s validity: the Board. Whether Milwaukee will proceed with a new district court case, and its scope, are unknowns. The Director should not credit Milwaukee’s reliance on nonexistent litigation as a basis to vacate Institution.

B. The Director’s Decision in IPR2026-00246 Is Unrelated to this Petition

There is also nothing inconsistent about the Director’s decision to

IPR2026-00233 (Patent 11,656,067)
Opposition to Request for Director Review

discretionarily deny IPR2026-00246 while granting institution here. IPR2026-00246 involved an unrelated patent, different art, and unique means-plus-function claim construction issues not present in the '067 Patent. Section II.A. Nonetheless, Milwaukee complains that the Director's decision to institute this IPR, while denying Institution for IPR2026-00246, created "unnecessary parallel proceedings" because it purportedly results in "the Board ... assess[ing] the Petition directed to the '067 Patent, while the district court will assess the '064 Patent." DR Br. at 1, 6–7. But no district court is assessing the Unrelated Patent; the To-Be-Dismissed Case will be dismissed and all deadlines other than briefing related to that dismissal were vacated in March. Ex-1031; Ex-1037. In fact, the only way a district court "assess[es] the '064 Patent" in parallel with this Petition is if Milwaukee chooses to file a new litigation asserting the Unrelated Patent. The purported inefficiencies of such a scenario are both speculative and entirely within Milwaukee's control: Milwaukee could avoid them by simply not filing such a suit.

Litigating the Unrelated Patent in district court would not lead to inefficiencies or inconsistent outcomes in any event. The Unrelated Patent has no relation to the '067 Patent: it has no overlapping named inventors, it claims different technology (detachable tool pouches vs tape measures with greater than 150 inches of standout), Milwaukee accused different products of infringing its claims, and Klein contended it was invalid in light of different prior art. Section II.A. To the

extent Milwaukee suggests both patents must be litigated together to “permit[] claim construction on a unified record,” this makes no sense given the patents are unrelated and neither party has identified overlapping claim terms for construction. DR Br. at 7.

Nothing in law or logic requires that two unrelated patents be tried together in the same forum, and Milwaukee cites no authority to the contrary. DR Br. at 6–7 (citing *Terumo BCT, Inc. v. Haemonetics Corp.*, IPR2025-01374, Paper 20 (May 12, 2026), *TikTok, Inc. v. Shopsee, Inc.*, IPR2025-01485, Paper 13 (Jan. 16, 2026), and *Light & Wonder, Inc. v. Evolution Malta Ltd.*, IPR2025-01072, Paper 30 at 3–6, Order (June 22, 2026) (precedential)). In *Terumo* and *TikTok*, the Director vacated institution because the petitioner took inconsistent claim construction positions⁴ in a parallel district court litigation without providing an explanation. *TikTok*, IPR2025-01485, Paper 13 at 2–3; *Terumo*, IPR2025-01374, Paper 20 at 4. In *Light & Wonder*, the Director vacated institution because the challenged claims had already been found invalid in the parallel district court proceeding. *Light & Wonder*, IPR2025-

⁴ While *Terumo* involved two IPRs, they were for related patents and it was a claim term common to both patents that the petitioner took an inconsistent position on. *Terumo BCT, Inc. v. Haemonetics Corp.*, IPR2025-01374, Paper 20 at 2–3 (May 12, 2026).

01072, Paper 30 at 4. None of these decisions involved a situation where the alleged inefficiency was parallel litigation of an *unrelated* patent, let alone where, as here, there was no valid parallel district court proceeding at all and the Director had already considered (and rejected) the patent owner's *Revvo* arguments.

By contrast, the Director has previously exercised discretion to deny institution for some, but not other, IPR petitions where multiple patents were asserted in a parallel litigation. *OnePlus Tech. (Shenzhen)*, IPR2025-00720, Paper 11 at 2–3; *Zhuhai CosMx Battery*, IPR2025-00524, Paper 10 at 2. The same outcome is warranted here.

IV. MILWAUKEE'S DISAGREEMENT WITH THE DIRECTOR'S EXERCISE OF DISCRETION UNDER *REVVO* DOES NOT WARRANT VACATUR

Milwaukee identifies no new evidence or error in the Institution Decision, merely complaining that it purportedly lacked “a reasoned basis.” DR Br. at 6–7 (Milwaukee arguing that Paper 15 lacks “a reasoned basis” for the different outcomes here). A request for Director Review is not an opportunity to relitigate POPR arguments, and Milwaukee identifies no factual or legal error in the Institution Decision. It simply disagrees with the Director's discretion and repackages the same rejected arguments: that Klein supposedly failed to explain an alleged inconsistency between its preliminary invalidity contentions alleging indefiniteness and its Petition positions. DR Br. at 4, 8–10. But as Klein repeatedly explained (Pet. at 15–17; Paper

12 at 1–2), its positions are entirely consistent. Simply put, there is a difference between reading the claims on the accused products, where measurements can vary depending on use, and the prior arts’ (*i.e.*, Hernandez and Murray’s) written disclosures with unambiguous numerical values. One user might extend the accused tape quickly and achieve more standout than another; or extend it so fast that it buckles, achieving relatively less standout. *Id.* Likewise, the accused tapes’ curved dimensions “vary along the length of the blade,” but Milwaukee identified only one “curved height” and “curved width” for each, without explaining why a POSA would pick that measurement. Pet. at 16. By contrast, Hernandez and Murray unambiguously disclose standout greater than 150 inches, a “curved profile” that does not “vary” but spans the entire blade, and numerical values that satisfy the curvature limitations. Pet. at 32–38, 40.

Milwaukee’s argument to the contrary, that “[c]laim construction is not target-dependent” is a red herring. DR Br. at 8. Klein’s construction does not differ between forums; the ambiguity only arises in the To-Be-Dismissed Case from Milwaukee’s characterization of the accused products’ dimensions, which vary. As Milwaukee concedes, “indefiniteness allegation[s] [do not] make[] prior-art analysis impossible.” DR Br. at 9; *Cochlear Bone Anchored Sols. AB v. Oticon Med. AB*, 958 F.3d 1348, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (indefiniteness does not “imply inability to conduct a prior-art analysis needed for an inter partes review”). That is particularly the case

where, as here, the claim limitations prescribe a range and the prior art references' disclosures unambiguously disclose the claimed ranges. *E.g.*, *Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*, IPR2025-00340, Paper 18 at 3–4, Order (Nov. 5, 2025) (describing situation where “limitation prescribed a range and only the outer bounds of the range were unclear” such that “notwithstanding the alleged indefiniteness of the claim term, an ordinary artisan would understand that the asserted art satisfies the claim limitation” as an example of a “sufficient level” of explanation under *Revvo*). There is therefore no issue “determin[ing] blade length, standout, curved width, curved height, and the claimed ratios,” for purposes of anticipation and obviousness, DR Br. at 9, because Hernandez and Murray disclose unambiguous ranges or values, in contrast to the varying measurements of the accused products resulting from Milwaukee’s ambiguous contentions.

Milwaukee is also wrong that the Petition did not satisfy Rule 42.104(b)(3). DR Br. at 10. The Petition identifies how the challenged claims are construed—according to their plain and ordinary meaning—and explained how that construction was consistent with Klein’s initial invalidity contentions.⁵ Pet. at 14–17. And again,

⁵ Milwaukee’s reliance on *Terumo* is therefore another red herring: Klein never contended that Rule 42.104(b)(3) did not apply. DR Br. at 10. Rather, consistent with its obligations under Rule 42.104(b)(3) and *Revvo*, the Petition identified

Milwaukee’s hand waving about risking an “inconsistent” “claim scope record” is baseless. DR Br. at 11. The To-Be-Dismissed Case *will be dismissed* with no claim construction ruling because Milwaukee lacked any rights in the ’067 patent when it sued Klein. Exs. 1028 at 4; 1029 at 1; Ex. 1037 at 9–14. Any suggestion that future litigation may raise such concerns is speculation given no such litigation exists and, even if filed, would likely be stayed given institution of this IPR.

V. MILWAUKEE’S DISAGREEMENT WITH THE DIRECTOR’S MERITS ANALYSIS DOES NOT WARRANT VACATUR

Milwaukee argues the Petition’s merits are “not so unusually strong that they justify fragmentation.” DR Br. at 11. There is no “fragmentation”—no other forum is analyzing the Unrelated Patent’s validity or infringement, nor would that be inefficient in any event given it is wholly unrelated to the ’067 Patent. Section III, *supra*. The Petition’s merits are also strong, and while Milwaukee re-raises arguments already considered at institution, Klein readdresses each below.

Ground 1 of the Petition demonstrates how Hernandez discloses every limitation of Claims 1–9 and 11–12 of the ’067 Patent. Pet. at 21–45. As it did in its POPR, Milwaukee complains that the Petition “uses general incorporation language”

Klein’s constructions and explained how its claim construction positions were consistent. Pet. at 14–17; Paper 12 at 1–2.

and “draws from different embodiments between two different references (Hernandez and Murray).” DR Br. at 9, 11. As explained in the Petition, and Klein’s opposition to Milwaukee’s request for discretionary denial, Hernandez expressly incorporates Murray by reference. Pet. at 26–27. Murray is therefore “as much a part of [Hernandez] as if the text was repeated in the application, and should be treated as part of the text of [Hernandez].” MPEP § 2163.07(b). Anything disclosed by Murray therefore *is* disclosed by Hernandez and “may still be considered for purposes of anticipation.” *Callaway Golf Co. v. Acushnet Co.*, 576 F.3d 1331, 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2009). Milwaukee’s argument that Murray should not be considered for anticipation because it is a “different reference[]” is simply wrong.⁶ DR Br. at 9.

Ground 2 is similarly strong,⁷ presenting an obviousness case based on Hernandez alone or Hernandez in combination with Murray for claims 1–9 and 11–12. Pet. at 45–66. Milwaukee’s argument that “Ground 2 treats interdependent blade

⁶ Milwaukee’s suggestion that the Petition relies solely on one “Murray embodiment” “for curved width” that somehow does not achieve the claimed standout in Ground 1 is also incorrect. As a non-limiting example, the Petition explains how Hernandez discloses a range of curved widths which also establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Pet. at 32–33, 35–36.

⁷ Milwaukee does not dispute the strength of Ground 3 in its Request.

properties as separate variables without explaining why a skilled artisan would select the values together or expect the claimed standout,” is also demonstrably wrong. DR Br. at 12. The Petition explains in detail, including with unrebutted testimony from Dr. Giachetti, how a POSA would arrive at the claimed values, and have a reasonable expectation of success in doing so. Pet. at 45–66. For example, the Petition explained how Murray expressly disclosed that a POSA would have known that blade standout depends on blade curvature and thickness, and that a POSA would have known how to adjust such values to arrive at a standout greater than 150 inches. *E.g.*, Pet. at 9, 45–66; Ex-1006 5:21–30; Ex-1003 at ¶33 (“A POSA in August 2017 would also have known how to adjust a blade’s curvature, flat width, and thickness to achieve a standout of ‘up to approximately 13 feet [156 inches]’”). Moreover, the ’067 Patent does not describe any blade dimension as critical, and its own disclosures admit that prior art tape measures had values within the claimed ranges. *See, e.g.*, Ex-1001 at 27–28, 30, 35; Pet. at 28–30, 33–38, 43–44.

VI. CONCLUSION

Milwaukee’s disagreement with the Director’s exercise of discretion is not grounds to vacate Institution. Milwaukee’s inefficiency arguments are fatally flawed because no valid parallel district court proceeding exists and the ’064 Patent, and therefore IPR2026-00246, are unrelated to this IPR. Milwaukee’s *Revvo* arguments were already considered and rejected. Milwaukee’s Request should be denied.

IPR2026-00233 (Patent 11,656,067)
Opposition to Request for Director Review

Date: August 21, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ W. Todd Baker

W. Todd Baker (Reg. No. 45,265)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 389-5000
Facsimile: (202) 389-5200

Ryan Kane, P.C. (*pro hac vice*)
Nathaniel DeLucia (*pro hac vice*)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

Attorneys for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This Opposition to Patent Owner's Request for Director Review complies with the 15-page limitation authorized by the Director. Ex. 3102.

/s/ W. Todd Baker

W. Todd Baker

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing document and supporting exhibit was served on August 21, 2026 on counsel of record for the

Patent Owner via email to the following addresses:

Dion M. Bregman, USPTO Reg. No. 45,645
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1400 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304
Tel.: 650.843.7519 / Fax: 650.843.4001

Jason C. White, USPTO Reg. No. 42,223
Scott D. Sherwin (pro hac vice forthcoming)
Maria E. Doukas, USPTO Reg. No. 67,084
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
110 North Wacker Dr., Ste. 2800, Chicago, IL, 60606-1511
Tel.: 312.324.1775 / Fax: 312.324.1001

Michael B. Barboun, USPTO Reg. No. 81,660
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
2222 Market St., Philadelphia, PA, 19103-3007
Tel.: 215.963.8859 / Fax: 215.963.5001

Email: Metco-067Patent-IPR@morganlewis.com

Date: August 21, 2026

/s/ W. Todd Baker

W. Todd Baker