

From: [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
To: [Vakili, Kamran](#); [Melissa Haapala](#); [Director Discretionary Decision](#)
Cc: [#SkechersHFLIPRs](#); [Jason Eisenberg](#); [Kristina Caggiano Kelly](#); [Jennifer Chagnon](#); [PTAB Account](#); [Trials](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2026-00342 -00343
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2026 9:13:50 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Patent Owner is authorized to file a 4-page reply in IPR2026-00342 and IPR2026-00343, due no later than Friday, August 7, 2026, limited to addressing the matters raised below. Petitioner is authorized to file a 4-page sur-reply, due no later than Wednesday, August 12, 2026.

From: Vakili, Kamran <KVakili@irell.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 11:01 PM
To: Melissa Haapala <MHaapala@sternekessler.com>; Director_Discretionary_Decision <Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov>
Cc: #SkechersHFLIPRs <SkechersHFLIPRs@irell.com>; Jason Eisenberg <jasone@sternekessler.com>; Kristina Caggiano Kelly <kckelly@sternekessler.com>; Jennifer Chagnon <JChagnon@sternekessler.com>; PTAB Account <PTAB@sternekessler.com>; Trials <Trials@USPTO.GOV>
Subject: RE: IPR2026-00342 -00343

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 Skechers opposes Fast IP's request, as there is no good cause for further briefing. Skechers' goal in filing its Amended Mandatory Notices was to simplify the issues presented in the discretionary denial briefing and moot the RPI dispute. Moreover, Fast IP already had the opportunity to address the impact of the filing of amended mandatory notices in its Discretionary Denial Briefs, and in fact did so (see, e.g., IPR2026-00342, Paper 11 at 18).

The proposed further briefing would also waste resources. In similar scenarios where petitioners have filed Amended Mandatory Notices, the Director has expunged the prior discretionary denial briefing based on the new filing date accorded to the petition. See *Curium US LLC v. Universität Heidelberg*, IPR2025-01582, Paper 11, 3 (February 25, 2026) (informative).

However, to the extent that the Director authorizes Fast IP to file a reply brief, Skechers respectfully requests authorization to file a sur-reply brief responding to the reply. There would be good cause for a sur-reply, as it would permit Skechers the opportunity to respond to the new arguments that Fast IP will make on reply.

Respectfully,
Kamran

Kamran Vakili, Ph.D

Irell & Manella LLP | kvakili@irell.com | www.irell.com
840 Newport Center Drive, Suite 400, Newport Beach, CA 92660
Direct: (949) 760-5151

This message and its contents are intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, transmission, dissemination or other use of this information by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

From: Melissa Haapala <MHaapala@sternekessler.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 7:37 PM

To: Director_Discretionary_Decision@uspto.gov

Cc: #SkechersHFLIPRs <SkechersHFLIPRs@irell.com>; Jason Eisenberg <jasone@sternekessler.com>; Kristina Caggiano Kelly <kckelly@sternekessler.com>; Jennifer Chagnon <JChagnon@sternekessler.com>; PTAB Account <PTAB@sternekessler.com>; Trials <trials@uspto.gov>

Subject: IPR2026-00342 -00343

Dear Director Squires,

Patent Owner, Fast IP, respectfully requests authorization to file a 4-page discretionary denial reply in each of the above-captioned matters.

After Fast IP called into question Petitioner's failure to identify all RPIs in its discretionary denial briefs, Petitioner filed Updated Mandatory Notices to update its RPIs to include its immediate parent entities on July 24, 2026. See Paper 12. Fast IP requests authorization to file a short reply brief to: (1) address the impact of Petitioner's update to the RPI on these proceedings under current Director decisions that have reset the filing date of the IPR to the date the correct RPI was entered into the proceeding; and (2) respond to the RPI arguments made by Petitioner in its discretionary denial opposition.

Fast IP respectfully submits that there is good cause to authorize the reply because the Petitioner's actions and arguments would necessarily affect the criteria used by the Director when making discretionary denial decisions according to factors published by the Director.

Fast IP has conferred with counsel for Petitioner, and Petitioner's position is that it does not believe additional briefing is warranted and intends to oppose Fast IP's request for additional briefing.

Respectfully,
Melissa

Melissa Haapala

Director

mhaapala@sternekessler.com



202-772-8532 direct
202-371-2600 main

1101 K Street NW, 10th Floor, Washington, DC 20005

Notice: The information in this electronic transmission (including any attachments) may contain confidential or legally privileged information and is intended solely for the individual(s) or entity(ies) named above. If you are not an intended recipient or an authorized agent, you are hereby notified that reading, distributing, or otherwise disseminating or copying, or taking any action based on the contents of this transmission is strictly prohibited. Any unauthorized interception of this transmission is illegal under the law. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender by return email and then destroy all copies of the transmission.

PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient(s) is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Thank you.