

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM ERICSSON,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00468
Patent 10,512,027 B2

Before GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, STEVEN M. AMUNDSON, and
STEPHEN E. BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BRADEN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. §§ 42.5, 42.121(a)

I. INTRODUCTION

An October 26, 2022, email from Patent Owner’s counsel to the Board requested a conference call in this proceeding to permit Patent Owner to satisfy the requirement in 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a) to confer with the Board before filing a motion to amend. An October 31, 2022, email to the Board stated that “[b]oth parties are comfortable with the Board’s processes with respect to motions to amend and wish to dispense with a conference call” according to 37 C.F.R. § 42.121(a), as authorized by the Board. Nonetheless, we issue this Order to provide additional information and guidance regarding the proposed motion to amend in lieu of a conference call.

II. DISCUSSION

We understand that Patent Owner intends to file a motion to amend. Patent Owner has not yet indicated whether it intends in its motion to amend to elect the option under the MTA Pilot Program to receive preliminary guidance from the Board on the substance of any amended claims. *See* Notice Regarding a New Pilot Program Concerning Motion to Amend Practice and Procedures in Trial Proceedings Under the America Invents Act Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, 84 Fed. Reg. 9,497 (Mar. 15, 2019) (“MTA Pilot Program Notice”).¹

We remind the parties that, although Patent Owner does not bear the burden of persuasion to demonstrate the patentability of any proposed

¹ The MTA Pilot Program has been extended until September 16, 2024 (or it may end sooner if replaced by a permanent program after notice-and-comment rulemaking). *See* <https://www.federalregister.gov/public-inspection/2022-21472/extension-of-the-patent-trial-and-appeal-board-motion-to-amend-pilot-program>.

IPR2022-00468
Patent 10,512,027 B2

substitute claims,² a motion to amend must still comply with several statutory and regulatory requirements, as discussed in *Lectrosonics, Inc. v. Zaxcom, Inc.*, IPR2018-01129, Paper 15 (PTAB Feb. 25, 2019) (precedential) (providing information and guidance regarding motions to amend). *See* 35 U.S.C. § 316(d) (statutory requirements for a motion to amend); 37 C.F.R. § 42.121 (regulatory requirements and burdens for a motion to amend). Patent Owner should follow the guidance provided in *Lectrosonics* and the Office's November 2019 Consolidated Trial Practice Guide to ensure that the motion to amend complies with all relevant statutory and regulatory requirements. 84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019), available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>. We also note that Patent Owner may propose only substitute claims, not amendments to original claims. Additionally, Patent Owner may propose only substitute claims for challenged claims, not unchallenged claims.

Because this *inter partes* review was instituted after March 15, 2019, the Motion to Amend Pilot Program applies. The details of the Motion to Amend Pilot Program are set forth in the MTA Pilot Program Notice. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. 9,497, as noted above. Importantly, if Patent Owner elects to seek non-binding preliminary guidance from the Board on its motion to amend, an explicit request for preliminary guidance must be included in the motion to amend filed no later than DUE DATE 1. Patent Owner has several options for addressing the Board's preliminary guidance and/or Petitioner's opposition, including filing a revised motion to amend. *See id.*

² *See Aqua Prods., Inc. v. Matal*, 872 F.3d 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2017); *Bosch Auto. Serv. Sols., LLC v. Matal*, 878 F.3d 1027 (Fed. Cir. 2017) (as amended Mar. 15, 2018).

IPR2022-00468
Patent 10,512,027 B2

at 9,499–502. We note that a request for preliminary guidance is not a prerequisite for filing a revised motion to amend, and Patent Owner may file a revised motion to amend regardless of whether it requested preliminary guidance. *See id.* at 9,501. Should Patent Owner file a revised motion to amend, the Board will issue a revised Scheduling Order to allow additional briefing. *See id.* The parties should carefully consult the MTA Pilot Program Notice for further details and guidance.

As stated in the Scheduling Order (Paper 9), the parties may not stipulate to a different date for either (i) the portion of DUE DATE 2 related to Petitioner’s opposition to the motion to amend or (ii) the portion of DUE DATE 3 related to Patent Owner’s reply to the opposition to the motion to amend (or Patent Owner’s revised motion to amend) without prior authorization from the Board. Paper 9, 8.

Finally, we remind the parties of their duty of candor under 37 C.F.R. § 42.11.

IPR2022-00468
Patent 10,512,027 B2

PETITIONER:

Adam P. Seitz
Paul R. Hart
Jennifer C. Bailey
ERISE IP, P.A.
adam.seitz@eriseip.com
paul.hart@eriseip.com
jennifer.bailey@eriseip.com

PATENT OWNER:

Peter C. Knops
Jason Wejnert
NOROOZIPC
peter@noroozipc.com
jason@noroozipc.com