

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIVERSAL REMOTE CONTROL, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Cases IPR2014-01102 (Patent 5,228,077)
IPR2014-01103 (Patent 5,552,917)
IPR2014-01104 (Patent 5,414,761)
IPR2014-01106 (Patent 5,255,313)
IPR2014-01109 (Patent 7,831,930)¹

Before HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, SALLY C. MEDLEY, WILLIAM
A. CAPP, and LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MEDLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceedings
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 are not authorized to use this style heading.

IPR2014-01102 (Patent 5,228,077)
IPR2014-01103 (Patent 5,552,917)
IPR2014-01104 (Patent 5,414,761)
IPR2014-01106 (Patent 5,255,313)
IPR2014-01109 (Patent 7,831,930)

Both parties in these proceedings have filed certain exhibits under seal. *See, e.g.*, IPR2014-01102, Exhibits 1050, 1051, 2030, 2031, 2033, 2039, 2040, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2048, 2049, and 2050. During oral hearing for IPR2014-01102, -01103, -01104, and -01106, counsel for Patent Owner informed the panel that Patent Owner had made a litigation decision to reveal certain previously sealed information for the public hearing. In light of Patent Owner's representations made during oral hearing, we are of the impression that certain currently sealed documents in the records of these proceedings may no longer need to be sealed.

There is a strong public policy in favor of making information filed in an *inter partes* review open to the public, especially because the proceeding determines the patentability of claims in an issued patent, and, therefore, affects the rights of the public. *See* Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48,756, 48,760 (Aug. 14, 2012). The default rule is that all papers filed in an *inter partes* review are open and available for access by the public; only confidential information may be protected from disclosure upon a showing of good cause. *See* 35 U.S.C. §§ 316(a)(1), 316(a)(7); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14, 42.54(a).

In order to simplify the issues with respect to which documents need to be sealed, the parties shall coordinate and determine which, if any, of the previously sealed exhibits no longer should be sealed. The parties shall file

IPR2014-01102 (Patent 5,228,077)
IPR2014-01103 (Patent 5,552,917)
IPR2014-01104 (Patent 5,414,761)
IPR2014-01106 (Patent 5,255,313)
IPR2014-01109 (Patent 7,831,930)

a joint paper, no longer than two pages, briefly explaining which, if any, previously sealed documents no longer need to be sealed.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the parties file, no later than August 26, 2015, a joint paper in each case, pertaining to that particular case, not exceeding two pages in length, indicating which, if any, previously sealed exhibits no longer need to be sealed.

FOR PETITIONER:

DOUGLAS MIRO
PETER KANG
THEODORE CHANDLER
FERENC PAZMANDI
KEITH BARKAUS
dmiro@ostrolenk.com
pkang@sidley.com
tchandler@sidley.com
fpazmandi@sidley.com
kbarkaus@ostrolenk.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

ERIC MAIERS
MICHAEL NICODEMA
JAMES LUKAS
ROBBIE HARMER
maierse@gtlaw.com
nicodemam@gtlaw.com
lukasj@gtlaw.com
harmer@gtlaw.com