

From: [Director_PTABDecision_Review](#)
To: "Ryan, Andrew"; [Director_PTABDecision_Review](#)
Cc: [Coyle, Steve](#); [Geiger, Nicholas](#); [HID-IPRs](#); [Devkar, Andrew V.](#)
Subject: RE: IPR2022-01045, -01089: Request for Director Review
Date: Tuesday, January 23, 2024 12:47:00 PM

Counsel,

Thank you for your email. 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>, 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.”). If the Director determines that briefing is necessary, counsel will be informed.

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.”).

Thank you.

From: Ryan, Andrew <aryan@cantorcolburn.com>
Sent: Monday, January 22, 2024 2:20 PM
To: Director_PTABDecision_Review <Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov>
Cc: Coyle, Steve <Scoyle@CantorColburn.com>; Geiger, Nicholas <NGeiger@CantorColburn.com>; HID-IPRs <HID-IPRs@morganlewis.com>; Devkar, Andrew V. <andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com>
Subject: RE: IPR2022-01045, -01089: 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.

To the Director:

The undersigned is lead counsel for Patent Owner in the referenced IPRs. Patent Owner requests leave to file a Reply to Petitioner’s Request for Director Review.

Should the Director need further information, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Andrew C. Ryan
Counsel for Patent Owner CPC Patent Technologies Pty Ltd.

Andrew C. Ryan
Partner
Cantor Colburn LLP

IPR2022-01045



20 Church Street | 22nd Floor | Hartford, CT 06103-3207

Work: 860-286-2929, ext. 1127 | Fax: 860-286-0115 |

ryan@cantorcolburn.com

www.cantorcolburn.com

HARTFORD WASHINGTON, D.C. ATLANTA HOUSTON DETROIT

From: Devkar, Andrew V. <andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com>

Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2024 9:00 PM

To: Director_PTABDecision_Review@uspto.gov

Cc: Ryan, Andrew <aryan@cantorcolburn.com>; Coyle, Steve <Scoyle@CantorColburn.com>; Geiger, Nicholas <NGeiger@CantorColburn.com>; HID-IPRs <HID-IPRs@morganlewis.com>

Subject: IPR2022-01045: 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 (IPR2022-01045) 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. 43. A copy is attached.

This request follows a request for Director review in IPR2022-01006 on a related patent involving identical issues.

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.*, IPR2020-00601, 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.

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 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, 91. 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 | www.morganlewis.com

Assistant: Karen Satterfield | +1.949.399.7141 | 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.