

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ASSA ABLOY AB, ASSA ABLOY INC.,
ASSA ABLOY RESIDENTIAL GROUP, INC.,
AUGUST HOME, INC.,
HID GLOBAL CORPORATION, and
ASSA ABLOY GLOBAL SOLUTIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

CPC PATENT TECHNOLOGIES PTY, LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)
IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)
IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)¹

Before BARRY L. GROSSMAN and AMBER L. HAGY,
Administrative Patent Judges.

GROSSMAN, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

SCHEDULING ORDER FOLLOWING REMAND

¹ This Order applies to each of the above captioned proceedings. Unless specifically authorized by the Board, the parties are not authorized to use this style of filing.

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)
IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)
IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)

This Scheduling Order is issued pursuant to the Director’s Review Decision vacating the Board’s Final Written Decisions and remanding these three cases to the Board Panel for further proceedings consistent with the Director’s Review Decision. Paper 49 (“Dir. Dec.” or “Director’s Decision”).² The Director’s Decision states:

[T]he Board shall authorize Petitioner to file supplemental briefing addressing: (1) the Board’s construction for the term “biometric signal” in the Final Written Decision and the application of the asserted art to the Board’s claim construction, and (2) perceived inconsistencies between the Final Written Decisions in these proceedings and those in IPR2022-00602 or IPR2022-00601, as applicable. The Board shall also authorize Patent Owner to file a supplemental response to Petitioner’s supplemental brief. After considering such briefing, the Board shall issue a new Final Written Decision in each of the captioned proceedings that considers the parties’ supplemental briefing when resolving the claim construction of “biometric signal,” the applicability of the prior art, and arguments as to inconsistency with IPR2022-00602 or IPR2022-00601, as applicable.

Dir. Dec. 7.

In accordance with the Director’s Decision, Petitioner is authorized to file a supplemental brief addressing: (1) the Board’s construction for the term “biometric signal” in the Final Written Decision and the application of the asserted art to the Board’s claim construction, and (2) perceived inconsistencies between the Final Written Decisions in these proceedings and those in IPR2022-00602 or IPR2022-00601, as applicable. Petitioner’s

² Unless otherwise noted, all citations are to papers and exhibits in IPR2022-01006. The same Order was filed in each of IPR2022-01045 and IPR2022-01089 as Paper 44.

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)
IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)
IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)

supplemental brief shall not exceed ten (10) pages and otherwise comply with all applicable rules for filing papers in IPR proceedings. Petitioner's supplemental brief is due April 12, 2024.

In accordance with the Director's Decision, Patent Owner is authorized to file a supplemental response to Petitioner's supplemental brief. Patent Owner's supplemental response shall not exceed ten (10) pages and otherwise comply with all applicable rules for filing papers in IPR proceedings. Patent Owner's supplemental response is due April 26, 2024, or 14 days after Petitioner's supplemental brief is filed, whichever is earlier.

ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the parties shall file supplemental briefing in each captioned proceeding consistent with the instructions and due dates stated above.

IPR2022-01006 (Patent 9,665,705 B2)
IPR2022-01045 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)
IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Dion Bregman
Andrew Devkar
James Kritsas
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
dion.bregman@morganlewis.com
andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com
james.kritsas@morganlewis.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Michael Rye
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
mrye@cantorcolburn.com