

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LUTRON ELECTRONICS CO., INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

GEIGTECHEAST BAY LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

PGR2020-00013  
Patent 10,294,717 B2

---

Before BARRY L. GROSSMAN, FRANCES L. IPPOLITO, and  
BRENT M. DOUGAL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

IPPOLITO, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER  
Granting Petitioner's Motion to Seal (Paper 69)  
*37 C.F.R. §§ 42.14, 42.54*

### *I. Introduction*

On April 27, 2021, Petitioner filed an unopposed Motion to Seal Petitioner's Reply in Support of Petitioner's Motion to Exclude. Paper 69. Petitioner provided a confidential version (Paper 67) and redacted, public version (Paper 68) of its Reply.

For the reasons discussed below, Petitioner's Motion is *granted*.

### *II. Discussion*

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.14, the default rule is that all papers filed in such proceedings are available to the public. Only "confidential information" is subject to protection against public disclosure. 35 U.S.C. § 326(a)(7); 37 C.F.R. § 42.55. The Board also observes a strong policy in favor of making all information filed in *inter partes* review proceedings open to the public. *See Argentum Pharms. LLC v. Alcon Research, Ltd.*, IPR2017-01053, Paper 27, 3–4 (PTAB Jan. 19, 2018) (informative). Petitioner, as the moving party, bears the burden of showing that the relief requested should be granted. 37 C.F.R. § 42.20(c).

Petitioner asserts that

Petitioner is filing this Motion to Seal because the Petitioner's Reply in Support of the Motion to Exclude contains confidential information that Petitioner certifies, to the best of its knowledge, has not been published or otherwise made public.

Mot. 3–4.

Based on our review of the Petitioner's Reply, we are persuaded that good cause exists to seal the confidential version of Petitioner's Reply (Paper 67). Additionally, Petitioner filed a public, redacted version of its Patent Owner Response, which is tailored to redact only confidential information. Paper 68.

Accordingly, Petitioner's Motion is *granted*.

*III. ORDER*

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion (Paper 69) to seal Petitioner's Reply in Support of Petitioner's Motion to Exclude (Paper 67) is *granted* and Paper 67 is hereby sealed in this proceeding.

For Petitioner:

Nirav Desai  
Jason Eisenberg  
Trevor O'Neill  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.  
Ndesai-ptab@sternekessler.com  
Jasone-ptab@sternekessler.com  
Toniell-ptab@sternekessler.com

For Patent Owner:

Gary Sorden  
Marcella Bodner  
COLE SCHOTZ P.C.  
gsorden@coleschotz.com  
mbodner@coleschotz.com