

From: [Trials](#)
To: [Dan T. Keese](#); [Colette Woo](#); [Entropic_IPRs@lowensteinweatherwax.com](#); [Amanda Tessar](#); [Jose R. Lopez](#); [Trevor J. Bervik](#); [Nathan Lowenstein](#); [Kenneth Weatherwax](#); [Jason.Engel.PTAB@klgates.com](#); [erik.halverson@klgates.com](#); [Trevor J. Bervik](#); [hendifar@lowensteinweatherwax.com](#); [kyle.kantarek@klgates.com](#); [nolan.hubbard@klgates.com](#); [matthew.blair@klgates.com](#)
Cc: [Trials](#)
Subject: RE: Sagemcom v. Entropic, IPR No. 2026-00263 -- Request for Authorization to File Preliminary Reply
Date: Thursday, October 1, 2026 9:04:24 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Counsel,

Petitioner is authorized to file a 1-page preliminary reply in IPR2026-00263, due no later than October 6, 2026, limited to addressing the issues raised in Petitioner's email below. Patent Owner is authorized to file a 1-page preliminary sur-reply in IPR2026-00263, due no later than October 9, 2026, limited to addressing the same issues.

The parties should file their briefs as papers in P-TACTS. The parties are not authorized to file any evidence at this time.

Regards,

Andrew Kellogg

Deputy Chief Clerk, Trials
Patent Trial and Appeal Board
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office



andrew.kellogg@uspto.gov
571-272-5366

From: Dan T. Keese <DTKeese@hollandhart.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2026 1:28 PM
To: Director_DI <Director_DI@uspto.gov>; Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>; Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Cc: [Entropic_IPRs@lowensteinweatherwax.com](#); [Amanda Tessar](#) <AJTessar@hollandhart.com>; [Jose R. Lopez](#) <JRLopez@hollandhart.com>; [Trevor J. Bervik](#) <TJBervik@hollandhart.com>; [Nathan Lowenstein](#) <lowenstein@lowensteinweatherwax.com>; [Kenneth Weatherwax](#) <weatherwax@lowensteinweatherwax.com>; [Colette Woo](#) <woo@lowensteinweatherwax.com>; [Jason.Engel.PTAB@klgates.com](#); [erik.halverson@klgates.com](#); [Trevor J. Bervik](#) <TJBervik@hollandhart.com>; [hendifar@lowensteinweatherwax.com](#); [kyle.kantarek@klgates.com](#); [nolan.hubbard@klgates.com](#); [matthew.blair@klgates.com](#)
Subject: Sagemcom v. Entropic, IPR No. 2026-00263 -- Request for Authorization to File Preliminary Reply

You don't often get email from dtkeese@hollandhart.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Director Squires,

Petitioner respectfully requests authorization to file a preliminary reply, not exceeding **one page**, to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response ("POPR") in IPR2026-00263. Petitioner proposes to file the reply within three business days of receiving authorization. Petitioner requested similar authorization on June 2, 2026, after Patent Owner filed a first (now expunged) Patent Owner Preliminary Response in this proceeding).

There is good cause for a reply because, at the time that Petitioner filed its Petition, Petitioner could not have anticipated that Patent Owner would file a Patent Owner Preliminary Response in this IPR (Paper 22) that is substantially similar to its post-institution Patent Owner Response from the Comcast IPR (IPR2025-00180, Paper 19) and therefore reinforces Petitioner's view that this IPR should be instituted and proceed directly to oral argument based on the Comcast record. Petitioner requests a short preliminary reply (one page) to explain this, including that Patent Owner's substantially similar POPR to a post-institution brief from a prior proceeding further shows these issues can and should be decided in a FWD here.

Petitioner has conferred with Patent Owner, and Patent Owner opposes this request. Patent Owner's position is that alleged overlap with arguments made in another proceeding is not good cause for a POPR reply; to the contrary, it confirms that Petitioner could have addressed any issues in its prior papers. Although styled as a POPR reply, the request appears to seek additional briefing on Petitioner's separate and unauthorized motion to adopt the record from a different proceeding and proceed directly to oral argument, rather than a reply to any new issue raised in the POPR. Petitioner has already submitted its motion and reply on that separate request, and there is no basis for further briefing on it.

If the Director needs additional information regarding good cause to grant this request, Petitioner requests a conference call, and the parties will confer and provide times of mutual availability.

Best regards,



**Holland
& Hart**

Daniel Keese

Partner

HOLLAND & HART LLP

dtkeese@hollandhart.com | T: 303-293-5196 | M: 541-207-70910
Admitted in California and Oregon

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is confidential and may be privileged. If you believe that this email has been sent to you in error, please reply to the sender that you received the message in error; then please delete this email.