

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

HYDRITE CHEMICAL CO.,  
Petitioner,

v.

SOLENIS TECHNOLOGIES, L.P.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01586  
Patent 8,841,469 B2

Case IPR2015-01592  
Patent 8,962,059 B1<sup>1</sup>

---

Before ERICA A. FRANKLIN, DONNA M. PRAISS, and  
JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHAGNON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER  
Conduct of Proceedings  
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

---

<sup>1</sup> This order addresses similar issues in both cases; therefore, we issue a single order to be entered in each case. The parties may not use this style heading in their papers without prior authorization.

IPR2015-01586 (Patent 8,841,469 B2)

IPR2015-01592 (Patent 8,962,059 B1)

In an email dated July 26, 2016, Patent Owner requested a conference call with the Board to discuss whether Patent Owner may file a motion to object, or other paper, to address portions of Petitioner's Reply Briefs that Patent Owner believes improperly include new arguments and refer to evidence that was not previously addressed in the Petitions.

The panel has considered Patent Owner's request, and a conference call is not necessary at this time. Patent Owner is authorized to file a paper in each proceeding calling the Board's attention to those portions of Petitioner's Reply that are believed by Patent Owner to raise new issues or belatedly present evidence. The paper should be in the form of a list providing the location and a concise description of any portion of the Petitioner's Reply that Patent Owner wishes to draw to the Board's attention, but it should not contain argument. The paper is limited to two (2) pages and should be filed by Due Date 4.

We also authorize Petitioner to file a paper in response to Patent Owner's submission in each proceeding. If filed by Petitioner, this paper should identify, in an itemized manner, what Petitioner regards as the material contained in the Patent Owner Response which triggered or caused the Petitioner to include in its Reply each item listed by Patent Owner and/or where each item listed by Patent Owner appears in the Petition, but it should not contain argument. This paper is also limited to two (2) pages and should be filed by Due Date 5.

In rendering a Final Written Decision, the Board will determine what weight, if any, is to be given to all of the presented evidence and arguments in accordance with the rules of the Board.

IPR2015-01586 (Patent 8,841,469 B2)

IPR2015-01592 (Patent 8,962,059 B1)

As a reminder to the parties and as set forth in the Scheduling Orders, the parties may also file, by Due Date 4, Motions to Exclude pursuant to 37 C.F.R § 42.64(c), which address the admissibility of any evidence for which an objection was timely filed in accordance with 37 C.F.R § 42.64(b)(1).

It is

ORDERED that the parties are authorized to file the above-discussed papers consistent with the requirements and deadlines set forth in this Order.

IPR2015-01586 (Patent 8,841,469 B2)  
IPR2015-01592 (Patent 8,962,059 B1)

PETITIONER:

Richard Roche  
Joel Austin  
Christopher J. Fahy  
QUARLES & BRADY LLP  
richard.roche@quarles.com  
joel.austin@quarles.com  
christopher.fahy@quarles.com

PATENT OWNER:

Joseph Lucci  
David N. Farsiou  
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
jlucci@bakerlaw.com  
dfarsiou@bakerlaw.com