Filed on behalf of:
Patent Owner
By: Nicholas J. Gallo (Lead Counsel)
Nicholas.Gallo@troutman.com
Bryan C. Smith (Back-up Counsel)
Bryan.Smith@troutman.com

Paper No. ____
Date: August 3, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ENTEGRIS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

GUDENG PRECISION INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.,
Patent Owner.

PGR2026-00037
Patent 12,347,711

PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.5

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.5 and the authorization from the Board dated July 30, 2026, Patent Owner submits this Motion for Extension of Time, requesting that the Board extend the due date for Patent Owner's Preliminary Response fourteen (14) days from the date of any approval of such an extension. Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(c)(1), the Board may modify by order any deadline that is set by rule, as long as "any applicable statutory pendency goal [is taken] into account." In addition, the extension of time "must be supported by a showing of good cause." 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(b)(2). For the reasons discussed below, this request will not negatively impact any statutory pendency goal and this request is supported by good cause.

NO STATUTORY PENDENCY GOAL WILL BE NEGATIVELY IMPACTED BY AN EXTENSION OF TIME

As a preliminary matter, since no post-grant review has yet been instituted, and because Patent Owner has not yet filed or affirmatively waived its Patent Owner's Preliminary Response, there is no applicable statutory pendency goal. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 324(c) (requiring determination of "whether to institute a post-grant review" within three months of either the filing of a Patent Owner's Preliminary Response or the expiration of the time for the patent owner to file a Preliminary Response); 35 U.S.C. § 323 (setting no statutory time limit for the filing of Patent Owner's Preliminary Response); 35 U.S.C. § 326(a)(11) (requiring that the final determination in any post-grant review be issued not later than one year after

institution). Accordingly, an extension of the due date for Patent Owner's Preliminary Response will not negatively impact a statutory pendency goal.

THERE IS GOOD CAUSE FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

A. Background Leading to Present Extension Request

The facts and circumstances surrounding this request support a showing of good cause for extending the due date for Patent Owner's Preliminary Response.

The Petition in this post-grant review was filed on March 31, 2026. *See* Paper 1. The Notice of Filing Date Accorded issued on April 2, 2026, setting the three-month deadline for the Patent Owner to submit a Preliminary Response on July 2, 2026. *See* Paper 3.

Listed prosecution counsel of record for the challenged patent received a service package, including the Petition and exhibits, through USPS Priority Mail Express® on April 1, 2026. On April 6, 2026, prosecution counsel of record was notified by email from the internal recipient that the package was received. However, prosecution counsel of record inadvertently failed to appreciate that the package constituted service of a post-grant review petition and failed to act on the same.

On July 7, 2026, a communication from the Board was received indicating that "[n]o attorney has entered this case on behalf of Patent Owner." That

communication was subsequently forwarded via internal email to prosecution counsel of record the same day.

On July 20, 2026, prosecution counsel of record for Patent Owner sent an email to counsel for the Petitioner asserting in good faith that it had not received a service copy of the Petition or any supporting exhibits as required under 37 C.F.R. § 42.205. Continuing to believe in good faith that service had not been effected, later on July 20, 2026, counsel for Patent Owner sent a Notice of Defective Service to the Board with a Motion for Extension of Time.

On July 21, 2026, prosecution counsel of record received a responsive email from counsel for Petitioner asserting that Petitioner properly served a complete copy of the Petition and supporting exhibits by overnight mail on March 31, 2026. Upon receipt, prosecution counsel of record promptly investigated its files and internal correspondence and confirmed that service by the Petitioner was effected in satisfaction of 37 C.F.R. § 42.205.

On July 22, 2026, Patent Owner filed its Mandatory Notices (Paper 4), and the undersigned counsel appeared as lead and back-up counsel for Patent Owner in this proceeding. Undersigned counsel apologizes for the July 20, 2026 emails from prosecution counsel of record to the Board, which were procedurally improper and were based on a misunderstanding of service status. On July 23, 2026, by email to

the Board, undersigned counsel withdrew those July 20, 2026 filings and made a Request for Leave to File Motion for Extension of Time.

B. Inadvertent Law Office Failure Supports Good Cause

Patent Owner missed the July 2, 2026 deadline for filing a Preliminary Response because of a clerical and unintentional law office failure on the part of prosecution counsel of record for the Patent Owner.

Patent Owner submits that the requested extension of time is reasonable and will not adversely impact the remaining schedule of this proceeding, if a post-grant review is instituted. Patent Owner, upon realization of the error, acted quickly and diligently to request an extension of time to file its Patent Owner's Preliminary Response, and no prejudice would result from the minimal delay in filing a Patent Owner's Preliminary Response. In fact, judicial and party efficiency are best served by the filing of a Patent Owner's Preliminary Response, which would apprise the Board of issues supportive of a denial of institution before the parties and the Board have to expend the time and resources necessary for post-institution activities in this proceeding prior to the filing of a Patent Owner's Response to the Petition. *See, e.g.*, 37 CFR 42.5(3) ("**(3)** ***Late action.*** A late action will be excused on a showing of good cause or upon a Board decision that consideration on the merits would be in the interests of justice").

For the foregoing reasons, the present Motion is supported by a showing of good cause warranting the extension of the due date for the Patent Owner's Preliminary Response. Accordingly, Patent Owner respectfully requests that the Board grant the Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 3, 2026

/Nicholas J. Gallo/
Nicholas J. Gallo (Lead Counsel)
Registration No. 60,758

Troutman Pepper Locke LLP
80 Linden Oaks, Suite 320
Rochester, NY 14625
Tel: (585) 270-2133
Fax: (585) 270-2179
E-mail: Nicholas.Gallo@troutman.com

Bryan C. Smith (Back-up Counsel)
Registration No. 59,767
Troutman Pepper Locke LLP
80 Linden Oaks, Suite 320
Rochester, NY 14625
Tel: (585) 270-2141
Fax: (585) 270-2179
E-mail: Bryan.Smith@troutman.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), this is to certify that on this 3rd day of August, 2026, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PATENT OWNER'S OPPOSED MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE PRELIMINARY RESPONSE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 42.5** by e-mail on the following counsel of record (as identified in the Petition):

Eliot D. Williams (Reg. No. 50,822)
eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com
Tel: (202) 639-1334
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-5692

Service email:
DLBBEntegrisGudengPGR@BakerBotts.com

Lead Counsel for Petitioner

Katharine Burke
(*pro hac vice* application forthcoming)
katharine.burke@bakerbotts.com
Tel: (202) 639-7720
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-5692

Frank Zhu (Reg. No. 71,214)
Frank.zhu@bakerbotts.com
Tel: (212) 408-2549
Matthew Thompson (Reg. No. 80,905)
matthew.thompson@bakerbotts.com
Tel: (212) 408-2580
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112-4498

Back-up Counsel for Petitioner

/Nicholas J. Gallo/
Nicholas J. Gallo (Lead Counsel)
Registration No. 60,758