Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper 39
Date: September 15, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

XIFI NETWORKS R&D, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-01203 (Patent 11,849,337 B1); IPR2025-01204 (Patent 11,818,591 B2)
IPR2025-01205 (Patent 12,003,976 B1); IPR2025-01206 (Patent 11,950,105 B1)
IPR2025-01207 (Patent 12,015,933 B1); IPR2025-01208 (Patent 11,974,143 B2)
IPR2025-01209 (Patent 11,856,414 B1); IPR2025-01270 (Patent 12,114,177 B2)
PGR2025-00067 (Patent 12,190,198 B1); PGR2025-00068 (Patent 12,169,756 B2)
PGR2025-00069 (Patent 12,250,564 B2)[1]

Before HUNG H. BUI, KEVIN W. CHERRY, KEVIN C. TROCK,
JOHN D. HAMANN, MICHAEL T. CYGAN, and STEPHEN E. BELISLE,
Administrative Patent Judges.[2]

PER CURIAM.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

---

[1] This Order addresses issues that are the same in the identified cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this filing style in subsequent papers.

[2] This is not an order by an expanded panel. The Administrative Patent Judges listed are paneled in various groups of three in the above-identified proceedings.

The Board held a consolidated pre-hearing conference call with counsel for Petitioner and Patent Owner on Monday, September 14, 2026, in IPR2025-01203, IPR2025-01204, IPR2025-01205, IPR2025-01206, IPR2025-01207, IPR2025-01208, IPR2025-01209, IPR2025-01270, PGR2025-00067, PGR2025-00068, and PGR2025-00069.

The purpose of the pre-hearing conference was for the Board panels to provide guidance as to particular issues that the panels would like the parties to address at the oral hearing, and to provide the parties the opportunity to identify (but not argue) any issues the parties would like to address at the oral hearing. During the call, the Board panels offered several claim construction and technical issues for the parties preferably to address during the oral hearing, including, for example, the construction of "virtual MAC interface" and "without disassociation," issues relating to the operational relationship among OSI layers in the context of the challenged claims and the prior art, and features of OFDMA and their impact on the parties' obviousness arguments. Neither party posed any questions to the Board panels.

Notwithstanding the Board panels' particular issues of interest identified during the call, the parties may not present any new argument or evidence during the oral hearing. Any responses during the oral hearing to the issues of interest to the Board panel must be grounded in argument and evidence in the records of the subject cases.

SO ORDERED.

For PETITIONER:

James M. Glass
Benjamin Kleinman
Quincy Lu
Patrick T. Schmidt
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com
benjaminkleinman@quinnemanuel.com
quincylu@quinnemanuel.com
patrickschmidt@quinnemanuel.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Cyrus A. Morton
Jessica L. Gutierrez
ROBINS KAPLAN LLP
cmorton@robinskaplan.com
jgutierrez@robinskaplan.com
rkxifi@robinskaplan.com