

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
RESEARCH INSTITUTE,  
KWANGWOON UNIVERSITY INDUSTRY-ACADEMIC  
COLLABORATION FOUNDATION, AND  
UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY COOPERATION GROUP  
OF KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2021-00368  
Patent 9,736,484 B2

---

Before JAMESON LEE, SALLY C. MEDLEY, and  
NATHAN A. ENGELS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ENGELS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Granting Renewed Motion for Entry of Modified Protective Order  
and Renewed Motion to Seal  
*37 C.F.R. §§ 42.54, 42.55*

## INTRODUCTION

Petitioner's first Motion to Entry of Protective Order (Paper 9) was denied because Petitioner had not shown good cause for entry of a protective order that imposed obligations on employees and representative of the Patent Office beyond the obligations included in the Board's default protective order (*see* Paper 13 (Order denying Paper 9)). Petitioner's first Motion to Seal (Paper 11) was also denied (Paper 14 (Order denying Paper 11)).

Petitioner filed a Renewed Motion for Entry of Protective Order (Paper 16) with a new protective order (Exhibit 1051) and redlined comparison of the new protective order to the Board's default protective order (Exhibit 1052). Petitioner also filed a Renewed Motion to Seal Patent Owner Preliminary Response and Exhibits 2002–2007 and 2012. Paper 15.

Petitioner represents that Patent Owner has agreed to entry of the new protective order. Paper 16, 1. Petitioner also states that Patent Owner opposes sealing Exhibit 2005 and the discussion of Exhibit 2005 in the Preliminary Response. Paper 15, 1–2.

## DISCUSSION

We have reviewed the Renewed Motion to Seal and the Renewed Motion for Entry of Protective Order. The deficiencies we articulated in denying Petitioner's first Motion for Entry of Protective Order and first Motion to Seal have been cured. Good cause exists for entry of the proposed protective order now submitted as Exhibit 1051.

We are persuaded that Patent Owner's Preliminary Response (Paper 10) contains confidential information that should be protected under the Protective Order, and Petitioner filed a redacted version of Patent Owner's Response that is available to the public (Ex. 1049). We are also persuaded

IPR2021-00368  
Patent 9,736,484 B2

that Exhibits 2003–2007 and 2012 contain confidential information that should be protected under the Protective Order, and Petitioner has filed redacted copies of those Exhibits as Exhibits 1043–1049. Additionally, Petitioner has shown good cause for sealing Exhibit 2002 in its entirety.

ORDER

It is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Renewed Motion for Entry of Protective Order is *granted*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner’s Renewed Motion to Seal Patent Owner’s Preliminary Response and Exhibits 2002–2007 and 2012 is *granted*.

IPR2021-00368  
Patent 9,736,484 B2

For PETITIONER:

Andrew R. Sommer  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
[sommera@gtlaw.com](mailto:sommer@gtlaw.com)

Ashraf Fawzy  
Roshan S. Mansinghani  
UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC  
[afawzy@unifiedpatents.com](mailto:afawzy@unifiedpatents.com)  
[roshan@unifiedpatents.com](mailto:roshan@unifiedpatents.com)

For PATENT OWNER:

William H. Mandir  
Fadi Kiblawi  
John F. Rabena  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
[wmandir@sughrue.com](mailto:wmandir@sughrue.com)  
[fkiblawi@sughrue.com](mailto:fkiblawi@sughrue.com)  
[jrabena@sughrue.com](mailto:jrabena@sughrue.com)