

**From:** [Director\\_PTABDecision\\_Review](#)  
**To:** [Ryan, Andrew](#); [Director\\_PTABDecision\\_Review](#)  
**Cc:** [Coyle, Steve](#); [Geiger, Nicholas](#); [HID-IPRs](#); [Devkar, Andrew V.](#)  
**Subject:** RE: IPR2022-01006: Request for Director Review  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 2, 2024 3:46:00 PM

---

Counsel,

Your request to file a response to the pending Director Request is *denied* at this time. See Revised Interim Director Review Process, available at <https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/decisions/revised-interim-director-review-process> at Section 5.A.ii.b (“Director Review decisions are generally made based on the existing record, without the need for responsive or amici curiae briefing. Responsive or amici curiae briefing may only be submitted if requested by the Director.”).

Your email and this response will be entered into the public record. See *id.* at Section 3.G (“All communications will be entered into the record of the proceeding.”). Counsel is cautioned against any further unauthorized communication.

Thank you.

---

**From:** Ryan, Andrew <[aryan@cantorcolburn.com](mailto:aryan@cantorcolburn.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 28, 2023 6:46 PM  
**To:** Director\_PTABDecision\_Review <[Director\\_PTABDecision\\_Review@uspto.gov](mailto:Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov)>  
**Cc:** Coyle, Steve <[Scoyle@CantorColburn.com](mailto:Scoyle@CantorColburn.com)>; Geiger, Nicholas <[NGeiger@CantorColburn.com](mailto:NGeiger@CantorColburn.com)>; HID-IPRs <[HID-IPRs@morganlewis.com](mailto:HID-IPRs@morganlewis.com)>; Devkar, Andrew V. <[andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com](mailto:andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: IPR2022-01006: Request for Director Review

**CAUTION:** This email has originated from a source outside of USPTO. PLEASE CONSIDER THE SOURCE before responding, clicking on links, or opening attachments.

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Katherine K. Vidal:

We represent Patent Owner, CPC Patent Technologies, PTY Ltd., in the above- referenced IPR. Patent Owner requests leave to file a response to Petitioner’s Request for Director Review (Paper 48) (“Request”). Patent Owner respectfully submits that a response is necessary to address arguments in the Request that were not presented in the trial, including with respect to claim construction and the teachings of the Mathiassen-067 reference.

Patent Owner has conferred with Petitioner about this request. Petitioner stated that it does not object to Patent Owner filing a response provided that Petitioner be permitted to file a short reply.

Patent Owner objects to the filing of a reply brief by Petitioner. It is Patent Owner’s position that the only further briefing that should be permitted is its response to Petitioner’s Request for Director Review. However, in the event Petitioner is permitted to file a reply, Patent Owner requests the right to file a short sur-reply. Petitioner has stated that it objects to Patent Owner filing a sur-reply.

Thank you for your consideration,

Andrew Ryan  
Counsel for Patent Owner

**Andrew C. Ryan**  
**Partner**  
**Cantor Colburn LLP**



20 Church Street | 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor | Hartford, CT 06103-3207  
Work: 860-286-2929, ext. 1127 | Fax: 860-286-0115 |  
[ryan@cantorcolburn.com](mailto:ryan@cantorcolburn.com)  
[www.cantorcolburn.com](http://www.cantorcolburn.com)

HARTFORD WASHINGTON, D.C. ATLANTA HOUSTON DETROIT

---

**From:** Devkar, Andrew V. <[andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com](mailto:andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, December 22, 2023 8:15 PM  
**To:** [Director\\_PTABDecision\\_Review@uspto.gov](mailto:Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov)  
**Cc:** Ryan, Andrew <[aryan@cantorcolburn.com](mailto:aryan@cantorcolburn.com)>; Coyle, Steve <[Scoyle@CantorColburn.com](mailto:Scoyle@CantorColburn.com)>; Geiger, Nicholas <[NGeiger@CantorColburn.com](mailto:NGeiger@CantorColburn.com)>; HID-IPRs <[HID-IPRs@morganlewis.com](mailto:HID-IPRs@morganlewis.com)>  
**Subject:** IPR2022-01006: Request for Director Review

Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Katherine K. Vidal:

Petitioners in the above-referenced *inter partes* review proceeding (IPR2022-01006) respectfully request that the Final Written Decision in that proceeding receive Director Review pursuant to the interim rules governing such review. The Request has been filed and assigned Paper No. 48. A copy is attached.

Ranked in order of importance are the following issues for which review is sought:

1) The same Panel construed the term “biometric signal” inconsistently in this proceeding and in a parallel *inter partes* review proceeding concerning the same challenged patent. *See Apple Inc. v. CPC Patent Technologies PTY, Ltd.*, IPR2020-00602, Final Written Decision (PTAB Sept. 27, 2023) [Paper No. 31] (“Apple FWD”). The Panel’s inconsistent findings concerning the same challenged patent and limitation in two different proceedings presents an important issue of law or policy. In the

parallel proceeding on the same patent, IPR2022-00602, Patent Owner has likewise requested reconsideration of its earlier Director review request (previously denied) based on the Board's inconsistent findings regarding "biometric signal." This is an exceedingly rare situation in which both Petitioners and Patent Owner argue that a specific IPR of the same patent should be reviewed based on the same Panel's inconsistent treatment of the same term.

2) The Panel's claim construction in this proceeding is also inconsistent with the claim language and specification and would lead to indefinite claims. The Panel's claim construction therefore constitutes an erroneous conclusion of law and erroneous finding of material fact.

3) In its Final Written Decision, the Panel failed to consider the express teachings in Mathiassen as well as both side's expert testimony supporting that the "biometric signal" limitations are disclosed in Mathiassen under any reasonable construction, including Petitioners' construction, Patent Owner's construction and the construction from the earlier Apple FWD. Specifically, in finding all claims not unpatentable, the Panel concluded that Mathiassen does not teach receiving a series of biometric signals because it stops "functioning as a fingerprint sensor." FWD, 85. This is directly contradicted by Mathiassen itself and is acknowledged by both side's experts, which the Board failed to consider. This was an abuse of discretion and an erroneous finding of material fact.

Regards,

Andrew Devkar  
Counsel for Petitioners

**Andrew V. Devkar**

**Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP**

2049 Century Park East, Suite 700 | Los Angeles, CA 90067

Direct: +1.310.255.9070 | Main: +1.310.907.1000 | Fax: +1.310.907.1001

[andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com](mailto:andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com) | [www.morganlewis.com](http://www.morganlewis.com)

Assistant: Karen Satterfield | +1.949.399.7141 | [karen.satterfield@morganlewis.com](mailto:karen.satterfield@morganlewis.com)

This transmission, and any attached files, may contain information from the law firm of Cantor Colburn LLP which is confidential and/or legally privileged. Such information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom this transmission is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this transmitted information is strictly prohibited, that copies of this transmission and any attached files should be deleted from your disk directories immediately, and that any printed copies of this transmission or attached files should be returned to this firm. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify us by telephone or e-mail immediately, and we will arrange for the return to Cantor Colburn LLP of any printed copies.