

From: [Trials](#)
To: [Trials](#); [Nicholas Stephens](#)
Cc: [Goldberg, Joshua](#); [Bell, James](#); [Esper, William](#); [IPR56407-0019IP1](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2026-00278 - Petitioner's Request to Reply to the POPR
Date: Thursday, July 2, 2026 7:58:50 AM

Petitioner is authorized to file a 3-page preliminary reply in IPR2026-00278, due no later than July 8, 2026, limited to addressing the issues raised in Petitioner's email below. Patent Owner is authorized to file a 3-page preliminary sur-reply in IPR2026-00278, due no later than July 13, 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.

From: Nicholas Stephens <nstephens@fr.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2026 5:00 PM
To: Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>; Director_DI <Director_DI@uspto.gov>
Cc: Goldberg, Joshua <Joshua.Goldberg@finnegan.com>; Bell, James <James.Bell@finnegan.com>; Esper, William <William.Esper@finnegan.com>; IPR56407-0019IP1 <IPR56407-0019IP1@fr.com>
Subject: IPR2026-00278 - Petitioner's Request to Reply to the POPR

You don't often get email from nstephens@fr.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.

Honorable Director,

Petitioner respectfully requests leave to file a 4-page Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (POPR) in IPR2026-00278. If authorized, the Reply would address errors in the implicit claim construction positions underlying Patent Owner's arguments on claim limitations [1.5] and [1.6.2], including related erroneous characterizations of the prior art.

Good cause supports Petitioner's request because Patent Owner's claim construction positions are inconsistent with disclosures in the specification of the '982 patent, and Petitioner could not reasonably have foreseen such inconsistencies before the Petition was filed. Additional briefing would also yield a more balanced and complete record on important issues raised in the POPR, which may bear on the Director's deliberations on institution. Petitioner would not oppose Patent Owner's submission of a Sur-Reply of equal length as the Reply.

The parties have conferred, and Patent Owner indicates that it opposes Petitioner's request.

Should the Director desire a conference call, the Parties can provide their mutual availability.

Respectfully,
Nicholas Stephens

Counsel for Petitioner Okta, Inc.

Nicholas Stephens
Principal ■ Fish & Richardson P.C.

T: 612 766 2018 | nstephens@fr.com | [Bio](#)

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

