

AIA TRIAL PETITION TEMPLATE GUIDANCE¹

A proceeding under the America Invents Act (“AIA”) before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“PTAB” or the “Board”) may result in a trial known as, for example, an *inter partes* review (“IPR”) or a post-grant review (“PGR”). Such a proceeding is initiated by a person or entity, other than the owner of the patent, filing a petition challenging the patentability of one or more claims of an issued United States patent. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 311 (addressing IPR), § 321 (addressing PGR); *see also* TPG at Part II.B (Petition); 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.

This Guidance and the companion Microsoft Word template (“the template”) are intended to assist a petitioner in preparing a petition; **they are only resources and their use is not required**. The petition template may be accessed here:

¹ The information in this Guidance is primarily based on three sources, which you should familiarize yourself with before preparing and filing a petition. The first source is the U.S. Patent Act, codified at Title 35 of the U.S. Code (cited below as “35 U.S.C. § [xxx]”). The code provisions for *inter partes* reviews (IPRs) are at 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–319, and those for post-grant reviews (PGRs) are at 35 U.S.C. §§ 321–329. The second source is the rules for “Trial Practice Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board,” available at Part 42 of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations (cited below as “37 C.F.R. § 42.[xxx]”). There are separate rules for IPRs and PGRs; however, the rules are similar and we may refer at times to only the IPR rules, as illustrative. The third source is the “Patent Trial and Appeal Board Trial Practice Guide” (“TPG”), www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/trial-practice-guide (web version). In addition to these sources, you should consult the Patent Trial and Appeal Board’s precedential and informative decisions, available at www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/precedential-informative-decisions. Precedential decisions are binding authority on the Board and may relate to, for example, major policy or procedural issues. Informative decisions provide Board norms on recurring issues or other helpful guidance.

www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/aia-trial-petition-template.docx.² A petition is not limited to the specific sections set forth in the template; there may be variations in content and format.

All documents in AIA proceedings, including the petition, must be filed electronically in the Office’s Patent Trial and Appeal Case Tracking System (“P-TACTS”). 37 C.F.R. § 42.6. Detailed information about how to file in P-TACTS is available at www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/p-tacts_faqs_20221007.pdf.

Below, this Guidance addresses the typical sections of a petition, as provided in the associated template. **This Guidance and the companion template are for general informational purposes only and do not constitute legal advice.**

COVER PAGE

A sample cover page is shown on the first page of the template.³ The cover page identifies the name of the petitioner(s), the name of the patent owner(s), the (full) number of the United States patent challenged in the petition,⁴ and the case number assigned by the Office to the proceeding (for example, IPR202[x]-01234 or PGR202[x]-01234). A petitioner can obtain the case number by beginning a filing in P-TACTS. The patent number and the case number for the petition are also included as a header on each subsequent page of the petition.

² A similar Guidance document and companion template for a patent owner’s preliminary response and response to a petition are available here: www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/ptab-help/guidance-and-templates-aia-proceedings.

³ The Board expects all briefing will include page numbering, beginning with page “1.” Page numbering starts on the first page after the Table of Contents, Table of Authorities, and Table of Exhibits.

⁴ Only one patent may be challenged in a petition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A petition should include a Table of Contents for ease of reference by the Board and public. 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a) (table of contents does not count toward word count limits).⁵ The Table of Contents identifies each section in the petition by name and the page number where the section begins. Provided below are the various petition sections shown in the Table of Contents in the template.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

A petition should include a Table of Authorities. 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a) (table of authorities does not count toward word count limits). The Table of Authorities identifies the legal authorities cited in the petition. This table includes all case law, statutes, rules, and other reference material, such as treatises, cited in the petition. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.13. The Table of Authorities identifies the page number(s) of the petition where each of the cited authorities appears.

TABLE OF EXHIBITS

When filing a petition, a petitioner must also file all of the evidence relied on to support its arguments. 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3). Evidence may consist of documents (e.g., the challenged patent, asserted prior art, scientific references), declarations (written witness testimony), transcripts of depositions of witnesses, and (rarely, but sometimes) physical things. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63. All evidence must be filed in the form of a properly formatted Exhibit.⁶ 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6, 42.63(d).

⁵ Petitions for IPRs are limited to 14,000 words; petitions for PGRs are limited to 18,700 words. 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a).

⁶ Exhibits are to be filed as searchable PDF files (to submit evidence in any other format; email the Board at Trials@uspto.gov for instructions or contact the Board 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. ET, at 571-272-9797). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.6. When filing an exhibit in the P-TACTS system, in addition to entering its exhibit number, provide a short, descriptive name (e.g., “Declaration of Jane Doe, Ph.D.”; “Jones Co. v.

Our rules require that the petition include a list of the exhibits with a brief description of each Exhibit. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(a)–(e); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a) (table/appendix of exhibits does not count toward word count limits).

If evidence filed with the petition contains confidential information, a petitioner can file that evidence with the petition on a confidential basis along with a motion to seal confidential portions of the petition and the confidential exhibits when filing the petition. 37 C.F.R. § 42.55; TPG at Part I.E.5. A motion to seal should be accompanied by a proposed protective order, such as the Board’s default protective order. 37 C.F.R. § 42.54. The Board will not enter a protective order by default, but only upon the grant of a motion. *Id.*; TPG at Part I.E.

INTRODUCTION

This section of a petition provides an opportunity to introduce the underlying technology, the challenged claims of the patent, the prior art reference(s) relied on to challenge the claims, the basis for challenge(s), e.g., obviousness or anticipation in an IPR (possibly others in a PGR), and any general background information important to understanding the arguments and/or the underlying technology.

Smith Inc. Claim Construction Order”; “U.S. Patent No. 9,876,543”) for the exhibit for easy identification. Using the word “Exhibit” followed by the exhibit number for the descriptive name of the exhibit when filing an exhibit in P-TACTS generally is not helpful because there is a separate field for the exhibit number. Witness testimony in declarations normally includes paragraph numbering. Optical character recognition (“OCR”) converts scanned images of text, such as in PDF files, into machine-readable text that can be searched, copied, edited, and highlighted. All evidence submitted as a PDF should normally be OCR’d (or an equivalent) and have electronically recognizable text that can be searched and copied, and should be cited in briefing (and in any declaration) by exhibit number rather than some other name. Exhibit PDF files may be marked with consecutive page numbers for citation, rather than citing any page numbers that appear in the original document, if necessary. **Submissions that do not meet these expectations may be refused.**

MANDATORY NOTICES

The Board's rules require all parties to identify all real parties in interest, related matters, lead and back-up counsel, and service information as further explained below. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8; TPG at Part I.D.1; *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a) (the mandatory notices do not count toward word count limits). A petitioner provides these notices in the petition and a patent owner typically files a separate paper for these notices.⁷ 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a).

- i. Real parties in interest. A petitioner is required to identify all real parties in interest to assist members of the Board, for example, in identifying potential conflicts, assuring proper application of statutory bars or estoppel, and protecting patent owners from harassment by successive petitions by the same or related parties. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(1). For more information, please consult the TPG at Part I.D. *See* 35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(2), 322(a)(2); *see also* PTAB's relevant precedential and informative decisions, available at www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/precedential-informative-decisions. Failure to identify all real parties in interest may result in dismissal of the petition. *See Corning Optical Communications RF, LLC v. PPC Broadband, Inc.*, IPR2014-00440, Paper 68 (PTAB Aug. 18, 2015) (precedential except § II.E.1).
- ii. Related matters. A petitioner must identify all judicial or administrative proceedings that would affect, or could be affected by, a decision in the AIA proceeding. Judicial proceedings include

⁷ Mandatory notices, including those relating to real parties in interest, must be updated during the proceeding within 21 days, if changes in circumstances warrant it. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(a)(3).

federal court proceedings involving the challenged patent.

Administrative proceedings refer to related patent applications, *ex parte* and *inter partes* reexaminations of a challenged patent, and other related AIA proceedings of a challenged patent. 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(2); TPG at Part I.D.2.

- iii. Lead and Back-up Counsel. If represented by an attorney, a petitioner must designate in the petition a lead counsel and a back-up counsel authorized to appear on the petitioner's behalf in the proceeding. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(b)(3), 42.10(a). Lead counsel must be a registered practitioner (admitted to practice before the USPTO). 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). In addition, a power of attorney appointing lead and back-up counsel must be filed. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b). Back-up counsel who are not registered to practice before the USPTO may be recognized as counsel *pro hac vice* (Latin for "for this occasion") upon a showing of good cause (requested by motion). TPG at Part I.B. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10 was updated to allow parties to file a motion to proceed without back-up counsel if they show good cause; lead counsel is still required to be a member of the patent bar. Further, the rule provides a fee-free procedure for seeking *pro hac vice* recognition for counsel previously recognized *pro hac vice* in an AIA proceeding.
- iv. Service information. A petitioner must provide information on how the Board or parties should serve papers and other information on the petitioner, e.g., via its counsel, such as by Priority Mail Express® or (preferably) electronically if the parties agree. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e), 42.8(b)(4). Typically, parties indicate one or more email addresses for service.

REQUIREMENTS FOR REVIEW

- i. Basis for standing. A petitioner must certify that the challenged patent is available for either IPR or PGR. *See* TPG at Part II.B.3 (Specific Requirements for Petition). A petitioner must also certify that the petitioner is not barred or estopped from requesting review of the challenged patent. *See* 35 U.S.C. §§ 311, 315, 321, 325; 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(a) (applicable to IPR). *See also* PTAB's relevant precedential and informative decisions, www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/precedential-informative-decisions. Note that there are timing requirements covering which patents are applicable for IPR and PGR proceedings. *See* 35 U.S.C. §§ 311, 321; 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.102, 42.104, 42.202, 42.204. For example, a petition for a PGR must be filed within nine months of issuance (or reissuance, with certain restrictions) of the challenged patent, while an IPR petition generally may not be filed until after this window closes. 35 U.S.C. §§ 311(c), 321(c); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.102(a), 42.202(a).
- ii. Payment of fees. The petition must be accompanied by the required fees. 35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(1), 321(a); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.15(a), 42.106(a)(3), 42.206(a)(3).

CHALLENGE AND RELIEF REQUESTED

Identification of challenged claims. A petitioner must identify the challenged claims of the patent. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(1)–(2), 42.204(b)(1)–(2). For example, a petitioner can say that the petition challenges claims 1–5 of the patent.

Summary of ground(s) of unpatentability. For ease of reference, a petitioner normally provides a summary of the asserted ground(s) of unpatentability, generally in the form of a table correlating the claims challenged with the basis for

challenge. A petitioner also must identify the prior art reference(s) (or other bases if a PGR) relied upon for each ground. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(4), 42.204(b)(4).

For example:

Ground #	Claim(s) Challenged	35 U.S.C. §	Reference(s)/Basis
#	1–3, 5	102	Brown [reference 1]
#	1–5	103	Brown, Smith [reference 2]
#	1–5	112(a) [only in PGR]	Failure to comply with the written description requirement

IPR petitions may include patentability challenges only for anticipation or obviousness under § 102 and § 103 of the Patent Act (Title 35 of the U.S. Code), respectively, and based only on prior art patents and printed publications. *See* 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103, 311(b), 312(a)(3). PGR petitions, on the other hand, may include patentability challenges under paragraph (2) or (3) of 35 U.S.C. § 282(b), which may expand the statutory bases to include things like patent subject matter eligibility, prior offers for sale, written description, enablement, and indefiniteness. *See* 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 112, 321(b), 322(a)(3). The AIA modified the Patent Act and, in addition to creating IPR and PGR proceedings, changed the language of the sections addressing patentability. Revisions to these sections took effect on March 16, 2013. The petition should indicate (usually in a footnote) whether the pre- or post-AIA versions of §§ 102 and 103 are applicable. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(2).

The style of the Summary of Grounds for Unpatentability is not a determinative issue in considering a petition, as there is no rule requiring any specific form, but presenting the summary in a table as shown above adds clarity.

OVERVIEW OF THE CHALLENGED PATENT

A petitioner may include an overview of the claimed invention and relevant disclosures (i.e., from the specification or, possibly, the prosecution history) of the challenged patent to help the Board understand the issues raised in the petition. If included, this section generally contains an explanation of the invention recited in the independent claims and any key dependent claims at issue, a discussion of the relevant portions of the patent's written description (i.e., the specification), and a discussion of other relevant information, such as key events from the prosecution history of the patent or related patents. For example, if certain claim language is expressly defined in the specification or explained during prosecution, this section may be used to introduce this disclosure.

As a part of this section, or as a separate section, the petition may include an overview of the relevant technology and background of the field of the invention, which may be useful to the Board.

If the priority (effective filing) date of the challenged patent is at issue, it is helpful to address the matter in this section (if the issue is particularly complex, it also may be discussed in a separate section of the petition).

LEVEL OF ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

The level of ordinary skill in the art and the hypothetical person of ordinary skill in the art are concepts relevant to several possible patentability issues raised in AIA proceedings, for example, in construing the language of the claims and in determining obviousness. *See generally* TPG; *see also* 35 U.S.C. § 103 (introducing the term). In this section of the petition, a petitioner should expressly identify how the person of ordinary skill in the art, as of the time of the invention or as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention, should be defined. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b). For example, this section can identify the education and experience, relevant knowledge, and specialized skills that an ordinarily skilled

artisan would have had as of the date of the invention or as of the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

A petitioner is required to provide a statement of how the challenged claims are to be construed, and “[w]here the claim to be construed contains a means-plus-function or step-plus-function limitation as permitted under 35 U.S.C. [§] 112(f), the construction of the claim must identify the specific portions of the specification that describe the structure, material, or acts corresponding to each claimed function.” 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104(b)(3), 42.204(b)(3); TPG at Part II.B.3 (Specific Requirements for Petition); *see also* TPG at Part II.B.5 (claim charts may be included).

If a petitioner believes the Board must expressly construe claim language, the petitioner must include a statement identifying the proposed construction and corresponding support, for example, in the specification of the patent. 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(3). It is important that all claim construction issues that may be necessary to decide the case be identified in the petition. A petitioner may also include a statement that the claim language requires no express construction. *See* TPG at Part II.B.5. If a petitioner chooses this option, the petitioner should not present arguments, express or implied, in other parts of the petition to assert that certain claim interpretations are required or desired to support petitioner’s positions on unpatentability.

If a petitioner’s claim construction positions in the petition are different from the claim construction positions it has taken as to the same claim terms in a separate proceeding, e.g., in litigation before a federal district court, this should be explained. *See Tesla, Inc. v. Intellectual Ventures II LLC*, IPR2025-00340, Paper 18 (Director Nov. 5, 2025) (informative); *Revvo Technologies, Inc. v. Cerebrum*

Sensor Technologies, Inc., IPR2025-00632, Paper 20 (Director Nov. 3, 2025) (precedential).

OVERVIEW OF ASSERTED PRIOR ART

“Where the grounds for unpatentability are based on prior art, the petition must specify where each element of the claim is found in the prior art,” which may be applicable in a PGR proceeding (where unpatentability challenges may be asserted for any reason under the statute), but will always be applicable in an IPR proceeding (where patentability challenges may be based only on anticipation or obviousness in view of prior art patents and printed publications). 37 C.F.R. § 42.204(b)(4); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4). This section of the petition can introduce the asserted prior art references, explain why they are prior art, and review their relevant disclosures. *See* 35 U.S.C. § 102 (defining prior art). Alternatively, such a discussion of the prior art references may be included in the respective portion(s) of the petition addressing the detailed ground(s) for unpatentability, discussed next.

DETAILED GROUNDS FOR UNPATENTABILITY

As noted above, petitions for IPR may include only patentability challenges based on anticipation or obviousness (under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103, respectively) in view of prior art patents and printed publications. *See* 35 U.S.C. §§ 311(b), 312(a)(3), 314(a). For a PGR, patentability challenges may be based on any ground of unpatentability under paragraph (2) or (3) of 35 U.S.C. § 282(b), which expands the permissible statutory bases to include, for example, 35 U.S.C. § 101 (e.g., subject matter eligibility), § 102 (prior offers for sale), and § 112 (written description, enablement, definiteness). *See* 35 U.S.C. §§ 321(b), 322(a)(3), 324(a). Whether for an IPR or a PGR, a petition must lay out, in detail and with particularity, the petitioner’s ground(s) for unpatentability, the supporting

rationale, and the supporting evidence. 35 U.S.C. §§ 312(a)(3), 322(a)(3); 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.104, 42.204; CTPG at Parts II.B, II.D.⁸

Under the rules, the petition must contain “[a] full statement of the reasons for the relief requested, including a detailed explanation of the significance of the evidence including material facts, and the governing law, rules, and precedent.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.22(a)(2). Irrespective of the format, every challenged claim and every element of each challenged claim should be addressed, without ambiguity.

As noted, IPR petitions are required to identify “in writing and with particularity, each claim challenged, the grounds on which the challenge to each claim is based, and the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim.” 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3); *see also* 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b) (specifying necessary elements of a petition). Claim charts are not required, but can be helpful to the Board, so long as they point out the specific evidence of record that corresponds to each element of the claim and are not provided as a replacement for the required explanation of the petitioner’s grounds, supporting rationale, and the significance of the cited evidence. TPG at Part II.B.5. Likewise, a petitioner should “avoid submitting a repository of all the information that a judge could possibly consider, and instead focus on concise, well-organized, easy-to-follow

⁸ The petition sets forth the framework for and guides the case through the entire proceeding. The petition should address all prior art references needed to prove the petitioner’s case and provide a sufficient argument for unpatentability based on those references (and/or other bases for unpatentability if the petition is for a PGR). If a trial is instituted, the petitioner may file a reply after the patent owner files a response to the petition, but the reply is for responding to arguments made in the patent owner’s response or comments by the Board in its decision on institution. In a reply, a petitioner may not assert new or modified patentability challenges—generally, no new evidence or arguments are permitted with or in a reply brief if they could have been presented earlier. *See* TPG at Part II.I.

arguments supported by readily identifiable evidence of record.” *Id.* at Part II.A.3; *see* 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(5). Ambiguity, over-inclusiveness, excessive grounds, presentation of grounds in an “and/or” form or in the alternative, and failure to delineate between asserted grounds, for example, may be reasons to deny a petitioner’s request to institute trial. 35 U.S.C. § 312(a)(3) (particularity requirement); 35 U.S.C. § 314(a) (discretion to deny institution).

A petitioner’s strategy in organizing the arguments is its own, but in general, a petitioner should consider presenting the strongest arguments first or exclusively. Weaker arguments can distract or detract from stronger arguments, so a petitioner should consider whether weaker arguments are necessary.

There are no specific organizational requirements, but best practices suggest identifying each ground of unpatentability under a separate heading. Subheadings are also useful and add clarity to a petition when multiple issues under any ground must be addressed.

Claims are best argued individually (a single argument, however, may apply to multiple claims). If, when arguing a specific claim, you refer back to arguments for a prior claim, ensure that the cross-reference specifically identifies the prior arguments. Although a petitioner may cross-reference arguments within a petition, understand that “[a]rguments must not be incorporated by reference from one document into another document.” 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3). Excessive internal references within a petition may be confusing.

Supportive citations to and explanation of relevant case law will benefit a petitioner’s arguments (*see* 37 C.F.R. § 42.13), but “unless there is a dispute over the applicable law, extended discussions of general patent law principles may not be necessary.” TPG at Part II.A.3.

OBJECTIVE INDICIA OF NON-OBVIOUSNESS OR OBVIOUSNESS (IF APPLICABLE)

When the obviousness of a claim is at issue, evidence pertaining to objective indicia of non-obviousness (or obviousness), such as commercial success, industry praise, long-felt but unmet need, etc., may be relevant. “In determining whether the subject matter of a claim would have been obvious over the prior art, the Board will review any objective evidence of nonobviousness proffered by the patent owner where appropriate.” TPG at Part II.A.6. If a petitioner has knowledge of objective indicia evidence relating to the challenged patent or expects such arguments by the patent owner, that petitioner should consider preemptively addressing objective indicia in the petition. This is especially true if the patent owner provided objective evidence of non-obviousness during prosecution of the application that issued as the challenged patent or addressed the issue in a related litigation.

DISCRETIONARY DENIAL OF INSTITUTION

Under 35 U.S.C. § 314(a), the Director has discretion to deny institution of an *inter partes* review and, similarly, under § 324(a), of a post-grant review. 35 U.S.C. §§ 314(a), 324(a); *Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee*, 579 U.S. 261, 272 (2016). Current Office procedures require discretionary denial issues to be handled separately from petitions. See www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/interim-director-discretionary-process for more information.

CONCLUSION

The petition may include a conclusion that summarizes the important points and relief requested.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH WORD COUNT LIMITS

Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d), “[a]ny paper whose length is specified by type-volume limits must include a certification stating the number of words in the paper.

A party may rely on the word count of the word-processing system used to prepare the paper.” *See also* TPG at Part II.A.3. An IPR petition is limited to 14,000 words and a PGR petition is limited to 18,700 words. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.24.

As stated in the Trial Practice Guide:

Parties should not abuse the process. Excessive words in figures, drawings, or images, deleting spacing between words, or using excessive acronyms or abbreviations for word phrases, in order to circumvent the rules on word count, may lead to a party’s brief not being considered. *See, e.g., Pi-Net Int’l, Inc. v. JPMorgan Chase & Co.*, 600 F. App’x 774 (Fed. Cir. 2015). Except in cases of obvious abuse, the Board will generally accept a party’s certification of compliance with word count limits.

TPG at Part II.A.3.

As an example, a certificate of compliance may state:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(d), I certify that this petition complies with the type-volume limitation of 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a)(1)(i) because it contains [#words (14,000 word limit for *inter partes* review/18,700 word limit for post grant review)], according to the word-processing system used to prepare this petition, excluding the parts of this petition that are exempted by 37 C.F.R. § 42.24(a) (including the table of contents, a table of authorities, mandatory notices, a certificate of service or this certificate word count, appendix of exhibits, and claim listings).

Such a certification should be dated and signed. The above language is not specifically required, but is merely an example, and other language may be used.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

“Each document [including the petition], other than an exhibit, must include a certificate of service at the end of that document. Any exhibit filed with the document may be included in the certification for the document.” 37 C.F.R.

§ 42.6(e)(4). As an example, a certificate of service for an IPR petition may state:

I hereby certify, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6 and 42.105, that a complete copy of the attached Petition for [*Inter Partes* or Post

Grant Review] of U.S. Patent [patent number], including all exhibits (Nos. 1[xxx]-1[xxy]), are being served via [means of delivery] on [date], the same day as the filing of the above-identified document in the United States Patent and Trademark Office/Patent Trial and Appeal Board, upon Patent Owner by serving the correspondence address of record with the USPTO as follows:

[Patent Owner's service address(es)]

Such a certification should be dated and signed. The above language is not specifically required, but is merely an example, and other language may be used.

* * *