UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MÖLNLYCKE HEALTH CARE AB, Petitioner,

v.

SMITH & NEPHEW, INC., Patent Owner.

> Case PGR2018-00035 Patent 9,642,750

Mailed: February 23, 2018

Before Carrie Johnson, Trial Paralegal

DOCKET

NOTICE OF FILING DATE ACCORDED TO PETITION AND TIME FOR FILING PATENT OWNER PRELIMINARY RESPONSE

The petition for post-grant review in the above proceeding has been accorded the filing date of February 9, 2018.

A review of the petition identified the following defect(s):

Exhibits must have a label with the petitioner's name and exhibit number, affixed to the lower right corner of the first page without obscuring information on the first page (or affixed to a duplicate first page if obscuring is unavoidable). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(d).

Petitioner must correct the defect(s) within **FIVE BUSINESS DAYS** from this notice. Failure to correct the defect(s) may result in an order to show cause as to why the Board should institute the trial. No substantive changes (e.g., new grounds) may be made to the petition.

Patent Owner may file a preliminary response to the petition no later than three months from the date of this notice. The preliminary response is limited to setting forth the reasons why the requested review should not be instituted. Patent Owner may also file an election to waive the preliminary response to expedite the proceeding. For more information, please consult the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), which is available on the Board Web site at <u>http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB</u>.

Patent Owner is advised of the requirement to submit mandatory notice information under 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(2) within 21 days of service of the petition.

The parties are encouraged to use the heading on the first page of this Notice for all future filings in the proceeding.

The parties are advised that under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), recognition of counsel *pro hac vice* requires a showing of good cause. The parties are authorized to file motions for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Such motions shall be filed in accordance with the "Order -- Authorizing Motion *for Pro Hac Vice* Admission" in Case IPR2013-00639,

PGR2018-00035 Patent 9,642,750

Paper 7, a copy of which is available on the Board Web site under "Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices."

The parties are reminded that unless otherwise permitted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(b)(2), all filings in this proceeding must be made electronically in Patent Trial and Appeal Board End to End (PTAB E2E), accessible from the Board Web site at <u>http://www.uspto.gov/PTAB</u>. To file documents, users must register with PTAB E2E. Information regarding how to register with and use PTAB E2E is available at the Board Web site.

If there are any questions pertaining to this notice, please contact [INSERT NAME OF PARALEGAL] at [INSERT PHONE NUMBER] or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board at 571-272-7822.

PETITIONER:

Mitchell A. Katz Richard W. Miller E. Jonas Jarvholm BALLARD SPAHR LLP katzma@ballardspahr.com millerrw@@ballardspahr.com jarvholmj@ballardspahr.com

PATENT OWNER:

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 Main Street Fourteenth Floor Irvine, CA 92614

NOTICE CONCERNING ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR)

The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) strongly encourages parties who are considering settlement to consider alternative dispute resolution as a means of settling the issues that may be raised in an AIA trial proceeding. Many AIA trials are settled prior to a Final Written Decision. Those considering settlement may wish to consider alternative dispute resolution techniques early in a proceeding to produce a quicker, mutually agreeable resolution of a dispute or to at least narrow the scope of matters in dispute. Alternative dispute resolution has the potential to save parties time and money.

Many non-profit organizations, both inside and outside the intellectual property field, offer alternative dispute resolution services. Listed below are the names and addresses of several such organizations. The listings are provided for the convenience of parties involved in cases before the PTAB; the PTAB does not sponsor or endorse any particular organization's alternative dispute resolution services. In addition, consideration may be given to utilizing independent alternative dispute resolution firms. Such firms may be located through a standard keyword Internet search.

CPR INSTITUTE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION	AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION (AIPLA)	AMERICAN ARBITRATIO N ASSOCIATIO N (AAA)	WORLD INTELLECTUA L PROPERTY ORGANIZATI ON (WIPO)	AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION (ABA)
Telephone:	Telephone:	Telephone:	Telephone: 41 22 338 9111	Telephone :
(212) 949-6490 Fax: (212) 949-8859	(703) 415-0780 Fax: (703) 415-0786	(212) 484-3266 Fax: (212) 307-4387	41 22 338 9111 Fax: 41 22 733 5428	(202) 662-1000 N/A
575 Lexington Ave	241 18th Street, South, Suite 700	140 West 51st Street	34, chemin des Colombettes	1050 Connecticut Ave, NW
New York, NY 10022	Arlington, VA 22202	New York, NY 10020	CH-1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Washington D.C. 20036
www.cpradr.org	www.aipla.org	www.adr.org	www.wipo.int	www.americanbar.org

If parties to an AIA trial proceeding consider using alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would like to know whether the parties ultimately decided to engage in alternative dispute resolution and the reasons why or why not. If the parties actually engage in alternative dispute resolution, the PTAB would be interested to learn what mechanism (e.g., arbitration, PGR2018-00035 Patent 9,642,750

mediation, etc.) was used and the general result. Such a statement from the parties is not required but would be helpful to the PTAB in assessing the value of alternative dispute resolution to parties involved in AIA trial proceedings. To report an experience with ADR, please forward a summary of the particulars to the following email address: PTAB_ADR_Comments@uspto.gov