Trials@uspto.gov
571.272.7822

Paper No. 17
Entered: November 29, 2022

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

LITE-ON TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

SENSOR ELECTRONIC TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-00780 (Patent 9,923,117 B2)
IPR2022-00781 (Patent 8,552,562 B2)[1]

Before DONNA M. PRAISS, KRISTINA M. KALAN, and ELIZABETH M. ROESEL, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

KALAN, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER
Granting Joint Motion to Extend Due Dates
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

[1] This Order addresses issues that are the same in each of the identified proceedings. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each proceeding. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

On November 28, 2022, Petitioner filed a Joint Statement Regarding Preference for Oral Argument Hearing Location and Joint Motion to Extend Due Date for Patent Owner's Sur-Reply to Petitioner's Reply and Oral Hearing in each of the captioned proceedings. Paper 15[2] ("Motion," "Motions," or "Mot."). For the reasons provided below, the Motions are *granted*.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(a), the Board may determine the proper course of conduct in a proceeding for any situation not specifically covered by the Rules and may enter non-final orders to administer the proceeding. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.5(c)(2), a request for an extension of time must be supported by a showing of good cause.

The Motions state that the parties prefer a hearing at the USPTO headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia. Mot. 1. The parties also request that the Board enter an Order extending the deadline for Patent Owner's Sur-reply to Petitioner's Reply and Oral Hearing because religious observances pose a conflict for Patent Owner's counsel. *Id.* The parties present the following chart of current and proposed revised due dates:

[2] For expediency, we cite to the paper filed in IPR2022-00780, unless otherwise indicated. A similar paper was filed in in IPR2022-00781.

Event	Current Date	Proposed Revised Date
Patent Owner's response; Patent Owner's motion to Amend	Friday, January 20, 2023	Thursday, January 26, 2023
Petitioner's reply; Petitioner's opposition to motion to amend	Friday, April 14, 2023	Thursday, April 20, 2023
Patent Owner's sur-reply; Patent Owner's reply to opposition to amend (or revised motion to amend)	Friday, May 26, 2023	Thursday, June 1, 2023
Request for oral argument	Friday, June 16, 2023	N/A
Petitioner's sur-reply; Motion to exclude evidence	Friday, July 7, 2023	Thursday, July 13, 2023
Opposition to motion to exclude; Request for prehearing conference	Friday, July 14, 2023	Thursday, July 20, 2023
Oral argument	Friday, July 28, 2023	Monday July 31 - Thursday, August 3

Based on the facts presented by the parties, there is good cause for the Board to modify and extend the due dates. Mot. 1. The Board also acknowledges the parties' preference for a hearing at the USPTO headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia. The rescheduled due dates shall be the ones set forth in the table presented above; however, the Request for Oral Argument (Due Date 4) is still required to be filed by a rescheduled due date of Thursday, June 22, 2023. The rescheduled hearing shall take place on Tuesday, August 1, 2023.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the parties' Motions are *granted*, and the due dates are extended as set forth in the table presented in the Motions and reproduced in this Order; and

FURTHER ORDERED that the Request for Oral Argument shall be due on June 22, 2023, and a rescheduled hearing in these proceedings shall take place on August 1, 2023.

PETITIONER:

Matthew W. Hindman
Jack Ko
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
matthew.hindman@pillsburylaw.com
jack.ko@pillsburylaw.com

PATENT OWNER:

David C. Radulescu
Kevin S. Kudlac
Bryon Wasserman
Jonathan Auerbach
RADULESCU LLP
david@radip.com
kevin@radip.com
bryon@radip.com
jonathan@radip.com