UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

TESLA, INC.,
Petitioner

v.

CHARGELOGIC LLC,
Patent Owner

Inter Partes Review Case No. IPR2026-00377
U.S. Patent No. 10,090,567

PETITIONER'S SUR-REPLY TO PATENT OWNER'S REPLY REQUESTING DISCRETIONARY DENIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ARGUMENT 2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Amazon.com, Inc. v. NL Giken Inc. ---------- 3
Ford Motor Co. v. AutoConnect Holdings LLC, IPR2025-01342, (Dir. May 12, 2026) ---------- 4
Generac Power Sys., Inc. v. Champion Power Equip., Inc., IPR2025-00805, (Dir. Feb. 3, 2026) ---------- 3
Terumo BCT Inc., v. Haemonetics Corp., IPR2025-01374, (Dir. May 12, 2026) --- 2
Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC, IPR2025-00340, (Dir. Nov. 5, 2025) -- 2
TikTok, Inc. v. ShopSee, Inc., IPR2025-01485, Paper 13, 2 (Dir. Jan. 16, 2026) - 4, 5

APPENDIX OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1001	U.S. Patent No. 10,090,567 to Austin ("the '567 Patent")
Exhibit 1002	U.S. Patent No. 10,090,567 File History ("the '567 File History")
Exhibit 1003	Declaration of Scott Andrews
Exhibit 1004	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0136371 to Sutardja ("Sutardja")
Exhibit 1005	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0021218 to Kelty et al. ("Kelty")
Exhibit 1006	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0039989 to Pollack et al. ("Pollack")
Exhibit 1007	U.S. Patent No. 5,623,194 to Boll et al. ("Boll")
Exhibit 1008	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0203973 to Gale et al. ("Gale")
Exhibit 1009	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2010/0102776 to Uchida ("Uchida")
Exhibit 1010	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0067974 to Zhang et al. ("Zhang")
Exhibit 1011	U.S. Patent No. 5,534,759 to Evans et al. ("Evans")
Exhibit 1012	U.S. Patent No. 5,596,261 to Suyama ("Suyama")
Exhibit 1013	Willett Kempton and Jasna Tomić. *Vehicle-to-grid power fundamentals: Calculating capacity and net revenue.* Journal of Power Sources, 2005, 144. pp. 268-279 ("Kempton")
Exhibit 1014	Chan, *The State of the Art of Electric and Hybrid Vehicles,* February 2002, Vol. 90, No. 2, IEEE ("Chan")
Exhibit 1015	*Electric Vehicle Battery Systems,* Sandeep Dhameja, Newnes, 2002 ("Sandeep")
Exhibit 1016	U.S. Patent No. 5,573,090 to Ross ("Ross")
Exhibit 1017	U.S. Patent No. 5,487,002 to Diller et al. ("Diller")
Exhibit 1018	Nadal, M. and Barbir, F. *Development of a Hybrid Fuel Cell/Battery Powered Electric Vehicle,* International Association for Hydrogen Energy, 1996 ("Nadal")
Exhibit 1019	U.S. Patent No. 7,084,859 to Pryor ("Pryor")
Exhibit 1020	PCT Application Pub. No. WO 2006/124130 to Hanssen et al. ("Hanssen")
Exhibit 1021	U.S. Patent No. 5,701,122 to Canedy ("Canedy")
Exhibit 1022	U.S. Patent No. 6,181,996 to Chou et al. ("Chou")
Exhibit 1023	U.S. Patent No. 7,764,932 to Rofougaran et al. ("Rofougaran")

Exhibit 1024	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0228879 to Witkowski et al. ("Witkowski")
Exhibit 1025	U.S. Patent No. 7,596,391 to Himmelstein ("Himmelstein")
Exhibit 1026	U.S. Patent Application No. 61/134,646 to Ambrozizk et al. ("Ambrozizk")
Exhibit 1027	U.S. Patent No. 7,956,570 to Lowenthal et al. ("Lowenthal-570")
Exhibit 1028	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2010/0211340 to Lowenthal et al. ("Lowenthal-340")
Exhibit 1029	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0312782 to Berdichevsky et al. ("Berdichevsky")
Exhibit 1030	U.S. Patent No. 7,693,609 to Kressner et al. ("Kressner")
Exhibit 1031	U.S. Patent No. 5,367,558 to Gillig et al. ("Gillig")
Exhibit 1032	William C.Y. Lee, *Wireless & Cellular Telecommunications*, McGraw-Hill (3rd Ed.) ("Lee")
Exhibit 1033	K. Shuaib et al., *Co-existence of Zigbee and WLAN, A Performance Study*, IEEE Xplore (2006) ("Shuaib")
Exhibit 1034	Jin-Shyan Lee, Yu-Wei Su, and Chung-Chou Shen, *A Comparative Study of Wireless Protocols: Bluetooth, UWB, ZigBee, and Wi-Fi,* The 33rd Annual Conference of the IEEE Industrial Electronics Society (IECON), (Nov. 5-8, 2007, Taipei, Taiwan) ("Su")
Exhibit 1035	*Specification of the Bluetooth System, Master Table of Contents & Compliance Requirements: Covered Core Package version: 2.0 + EDR,* 4 November 2004 ("Bluetooth Specification")
Exhibit 1036	The Massachusetts Division of Energy Resources, Sept. 2000, *INSTALLATION GUIDE FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING EQUIPMENT An Introduction to EVCE* ("NAME")
Exhibit 1037	U.S. Patent No. 5,467,006 to Sims ("Sims")
Exhibit 1038	U.S. Patent No. 8,531,162 to Hafner et al. ("Hafner")
Exhibit 1039	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2009/0021213 to Johnson ("Johnson")
Exhibit 1040	U.S. Patent No. 5,406,188 to Myslinski, et al. ("Myslinski")
Exhibit 1041	U.S. Patent No. 7,698,078 to Kelty et al. ("Kelty-078")
Exhibit 1042	U.S. Patent No. 5,548,200 to Nor et al. ("Nor")
Exhibit 1043	U.S. Patent No. 7,084,859 to Pryor ("Pryor")
Exhibit 1044	U.S. Patent No. 6,577,928 to Obradovich ("Obradovich")

Exhibit 1045	U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0230443 to Cramer et al. ("Cramer")
Exhibit 1046	U.S. Patent No. 5,963,140 to Kawaguchi et al. ("Kawaguchi")
Exhibit 1047	EP 1220350B1 to Ishii et al. ("Ishii")
Exhibit 1048	U.S. Patent No. 5,757,595 to Ozawa et al. ("Ozawa")
Exhibit 1049	U.S. Patent No. 8,063,757 to Frey et al. ("Frey")
Exhibit 1050	Japanese Application Publication 2003-333706 to Hayashi ("Hayashi")
Exhibit 1051	Japanese Application Publication 2006-074868A to Izuno et al. ("Izuno")
Exhibit 1052-1065	Intentionally Left Blank
Exhibit 1066	Patent Assignment to ChargeLogic LLC
Exhibit 1067	Isidore "Tesla's Secret Success Story: Model 3 is Best Selling Luxury Car in America," CNN Business, October 4, 2018
Exhibit 1068	Tesla Motors, Inc. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Consolidated and Excerpted Filings and Exhibits, 2014-2018
Exhibit 1069	Tesla Motors to Officially Open Tesla Factory – Home of the Model S, ir.tesla.com/press-release/tesla-motors-officially-open-tesla-factory-home-model-s, October 26, 2010
Exhibit 1070	Timeline: Tesla's Constructions of Gigafactories, manufacturingdigital.com/digital-factory/timeline-teslas-construction-gigafactories, May 10, 2021
Exhibit 1071	Tesla Motors Launches Revolutionary Supercharger Enabling Convenient Long Distance Driving, ir.tesla.com/press-release/tesla-motors-launches-revolutionary-supercharger-enabling, September 24, 2012
Exhibit 1072	Tesla Motors, Inc. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Excerpted Exhibit, Q4 and FY 2018 Update
Exhibit 1073	Lens Patent Search, Tesla Patent Documents Filed Between August 18, 2008, and October 2, 2018, https://www.lens.org/lens/search/patent/analysis?p=0&n=10&s=date_published&d=%2B&f=false&e=false&l=en&authorField=author&dateFilterField=filingDate, pulled September 4, 2026
Exhibit 1074	Tesla Motors, Inc. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Exhibit, Q4 and FY 2025 Update
Exhibit 1075	Screenshot of Elon Musk's Post on X Regarding $500M Supercharger Expansion, May 10, 2024

Exhibit 1076	Len's Patent Search, Tesla Patent Documents Filed Between October 2, 2018, and March 23, 2026, https://www.lens.org/lens/search/patent/analysis?p=0&n=10&s=date_published&d=%2B&f=false&e=false&l=en&authorField=author&dateFilterField=filingDate, pulled September 4, 2026
Exhibit 1077	Barry, "How the Tesla Model S Changed the World," CR90, June 22, 2022
Exhibit 1078	Aeternus, "Driving Innovation: Tesla's Marketing Strategy and Its Impact on Electric Vehicle Adoption," February 6, 2026
Exhibit 1079	U.S. Patent No. 6,963,186, to Hobbs
Exhibit 1080	John Squires, U.S.P.T.O. Memorandum, "Additional Discretionary Institution Consideration – US Manufacturing and Small Business Use of AIA Proceedings, March 11, 2026
Exhibit 1081	Cars.com, "American-Made Index," 2025
Exhibit 1082	Tesla, "Tesla Secures 1st Place on Cars.com 2025 American-Made Index," June 17, 2025
Exhibit 1083	Part 583 American Automobile Labeling Act Reports
Exhibit 1084	Tesla, Public Comments, "Comments from Tesla on the Revision to Rules of Practice Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (Docket No. PTO-P-2025-0025)" December 2, 2025
Exhibit 1085	Tesla, Public Comments, "Request for Comments on Operation of the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada (USTR-2025-0004)" November 3, 2025
Exhibit 1086	Tesla Manufacturing on X, October 2025
Exhibit 1087	Tesla North America on X, January 14, 2026
Exhibit 1088	U.S. Trade Commission, In the Matter of Certain Memory Devices and Electronic Devices Containing the Same, "Proposed Respondent Tesla, Inc.'s Pre-Institution Public Interest Statement," June 17, 2024
Exhibit 1089	Tesla On X, March 21, 2026
Exhibit 1090	IHS Markit now a part of S&P Global, The Economic Contributions of Tesla to the California Economy, 2018-2021, October 2022
Exhibit 1091	Tesla, "Tesla's California Footprint," January 3, 2023
Exhibit 1092	Tesla Form 10-Q March 31, 2026

Exhibit 1093	Tesla Annual Report December 31, 2025
Exhibit 1094-1095	*Left Intentionally Blank*
Exhibit 1096	Declaration of Brian Rosenthal

I. INTRODUCTION

The mistaken service of Tesla's invalidity contentions that included indefiniteness contentions on September 28 should not result in the discretionary denial of this IPR. The indefiniteness contentions were never meant to be in the final as-served contentions, and they were only there because of an internal miscommunication. Tesla apologizes for the mistake and the additional briefing it has caused. When Patent Owner identified the issue on September 29, within hours, Tesla took steps to correct it and moot the need for further briefing: it served amended contentions that removed all indefiniteness contentions less than 24 hours after the mistaken invalidity contentions were served and expressly committed not to present any indefiniteness contentions at any point in the Parallel Litigation. EX2035; EX2036. That commitment is unconditional and does not depend on whether these proceedings are instituted and not later vacated.

Tesla's concrete corrective actions evidence that it never intended to take inconsistent positions in the two proceedings. And Tesla's unconditional withdrawal of its inadvertently served indefiniteness contentions allays the concerns of gamesmanship and misuse of the IPR process to gain an upper hand in the overall litigation that underly Patent Owner's cited cases. In each case cited by Patent Owner, the petitioners waited until after their IPRs were instituted to raise their indefiniteness contentions in their litigation, refused to withdraw their inconsistent

positions until the issue was brought to the Director's attention, and, even then, only offered a ***conditional*** commitment to resolve the inconsistent claim constructions if the Director instituted their IPR. Not one of those facts is present here.

For these reasons and those below, Tesla respectfully asks that the Director consider Tesla's immediate corrective actions for the mistake. Viewed in the entirety, Tesla submits that the circumstances do not warrant discretionary denial and respectfully requests that the Director refer this proceeding to the merits panel.

II. ARGUMENT

Tesla does not dispute that its now-withdrawn indefiniteness contentions in the Parallel Litigation would have been inconsistent with its claim constructions in this IPR. Paper 10, 2-3. However, the circumstances here are distinguishable from those in *Tesla*, *Terumo*, and *Generac*. Paper 10, 3. In those cases, the petitioners waited until after institution to present their indefiniteness contentions and maintained that they should be permitted to do so—either because "petitioners "cannot raise indefiniteness challenges in an *inter partes* review," *Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*, IPR2025-00340, Paper 18 at 3 (Dir. Nov. 5, 2025) (informative), because the relevant term's claim construction was immaterial to the prior art analysis and was otherwise not in controversy in the IPR, *Terumo BCT Inc., v. Haemonetics Corp.*, IPR2025-01374, Paper 20 at 2-3 (Dir. May 12, 2026), or because a POSITA would understand the relevant terms "with adequate precision"

for purposes of the IPR, *Generac Power Sys., Inc. v. Champion Power Equip., Inc.*, IPR2025-00805, Paper 40 at 5 (Dir. Feb. 3, 2026).

Here, Tesla is ***not*** maintaining that it should be permitted to argue indefiniteness in the Parallel Litigation. Tesla's presentation of indefiniteness contentions in the Parallel Litigation was in error, Tesla promptly withdrew its contentions, and Tesla affirmed that it "does not present ***and will not present*** in this litigation any argument that any claim term is indefinite under § 112, ¶ 2." EX2035 (emphasis added). Thus, Patent Owner is mistaken that Tesla waited to "disclose[] or explain[] its inconsistent positions" (because it did not intend to raise those positions) and "proposed express and plain-and-ordinary constructions in IPRs while asserting indefiniteness for the same terms in litigation." Paper 10, 3.

Tesla's corrective actions, contrary to Patent Owner's contention (Paper 10, 4-5), completely nullify any risk of inconsistent positions between this IPR and the Parallel Litigation. The Board's decision in *Amazon.com, Inc. v. NL Giken Inc.*, is instructive. IPR2025-00050, Paper 12 (PTAB May 23, 2025). There, "Patent Owner [] contend[ed] that Petitioner ha[d] taken inconsistent positions in this proceeding because, in the district court, Petitioner argue[d] that many limitations of the challenged claims here [were] indefinite." *Id*. at 12. Then the Petitioner wholly withdrew its indefiniteness contentions. *Id*. Accordingly, the Board concluded that "Petitioner no longer takes inconsistent positions between this proceeding and the

Related Litigation[,]" and concluded that *Fintiv* Factor 4 "weigh[ed] against exercising discretion to deny institution." *Id*. Likewise here, Tesla has withdrawn any indefiniteness positions, is not taking any inconsistent positions between this IPR and the Parallel Litigation, and, unlike the petitioner in *Amazon*, Tesla never meant to take inconsistent positions in the first place.

The Director's decisions in *Ford* and *TikTok* do not warrant the opposite conclusion here. In both cases, the petitioners waited until ***after*** the patent owner brought the petitioners' indefiniteness contentions to the Office's attention and, even then, both petitioners agreed only to ***conditional*** stipulations to withdraw or abandon their indefiniteness contentions if their IPRs were instituted and/or maintained. *Ford Motor Co. v. AutoConnect Holdings LLC*, IPR2025-01342, Paper 27 at 3 (Dir. May 12, 2026) (informative); *TikTok, Inc. v. ShopSee, Inc.*, IPR2025-01485, Paper 13, 2 (Dir. Jan. 16, 2026). By contrast, Tesla withdrew its contentions as soon as it became aware of the mistake and *before* Patent Owner reached out to the Office and unconditionally affirmed that it will not pursue indefiniteness in the Parallel Litigation at any time.

That Patent Owner is skeptical of Tesla's error (Paper 10, 4-5) is irrelevant to the Director's analysis. In any event, Patent Owner misunderstands Tesla's mistake. The inclusion of indefiniteness was not akin to a "typo," but was the result of a miscommunication. EX1096, ¶ 5. While potential indefiniteness contentions had

been added to the draft cover pleading, they were not supposed to be included in Tesla's final, served version. *Id*. Tesla's litigation counsel only realized it had neglected to delete the draft indefiniteness section in the final version *after* it was served. *Id*., ¶¶ 5-7. Given the nature of this error, a certification from Tesla was not required with its amendment, as Patent Owner suggests. Paper 10, 4-5. A document was mis-served. That mistake is no different from inadvertently serving a document from another case or an earlier, non-final version of a draft. No new information was added to Tesla's corrected invalidity contentions, so no certification or motion practice was needed. EX1096, ¶ 9.

As these facts show, it is simply not the case that Tesla only withdrew its contentions "because ChargeLogic told Tesla it was going to inform the Office of the inconsistent positions." Paper 10, 5. Nor would crediting Tesla's withdrawal "penalize patent owners" going forward. *Id*. Tesla has given up its right to pursue indefiniteness in the Parallel Litigation unconditionally. It did so before the Director made his discretionary denial or institution decision, and before the parties had even begun claim construction briefing in the Parallel Litigation. As a result, Patent Owner has not been penalized or prejudiced in any way; it remains in the same situation as a week ago, before Tesla mis-served the wrong version of its invalidity contentions. Under these circumstances, Tesla's promptly corrected mistake should not provide an independent basis for discretionary denial.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: /s/ Jennifer C. Bailey
Jennifer C. Bailey, Reg. No. 52,583
COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE ON PATENT OWNER
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.105

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on October 7, 2026, the foregoing *Petitioner's Sur-Reply* was served via electronic filing with the Board and via Electronic Mail on the following counsel of record for Patent Owner:

Stephen D. Zinda (stephen@chzfirm.com)
James H. Hall (james@chzfirm.com)
paralegal@chzfirm.com

BY: */s/ Jennifer C. Bailey*
Jennifer C. Bailey, Reg. No. 52,583

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONERS