

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MINIATURE PRECISION COMPONENTS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

EAGLE INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01403
Patent 8,205,592 B2

Before MICHAEL W. KIM, JAMES A. WORTH, and
RICHARD H. MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Conduct of the Proceeding
37 C.F.R. § 42.5

On June 5, 2018, Petitioner contacted the Board to summarize a disagreement between the parties regarding the scope of Patent Owner's Supplemental Response. *See* Paper 19. More specifically, Petitioner indicated that the parties conferred to discuss whether Patent Owner's Supplemental Response exceeded the scope authorized by our Order authorizing the Supplemental Response. Paper 16, 2. The parties sought a conference call with the Board to discuss the disagreement.

We have performed a cursory review of the record, and, at this time, do not see a need for conference call with the parties. We believe that any arguments regarding the allegedly improper scope of Patent Owner's Supplemental Response can be addressed adequately in Petitioner's Reply, or, if necessary, in motions practice. The dispute will then be addressed and resolved, if necessary, in the Final Written Decision.

Please note that this Order does not reach the merits of the parties' disagreement. We remind the parties to follow the Board's rules and orders regarding the proper scope of briefing and oral argument in this proceeding.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the request for a conference call to discuss the parties' disagreement regarding the scope of Patent Owner's Supplemental Response is DENIED.

IPR2017-01403
Patent 8,205,592 B2

For PETITIONER:

John S. Artz
Bryan J. Schomer
DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
jsartz@dickinsonwright.com
bschomer@dickinsonwright.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Jacob D. Koering
CANFIELD, PADDOCK & STONE
koering@millercanfield.com