

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WEBASTO ROOF SYSTEMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

UUSI, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2014-00650
Patent 7,579,802

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Attorney Docket: 130163.231151

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a) and the Scheduling Order (Paper 15), Petitioner respectfully requests oral argument. Oral argument in this proceeding (IPR2014-00650) is scheduled for June 29, 2015. Oral argument in IPR2014-00648 and IPR2014-00649 is also scheduled for June 29, 2015. Petitioner proposes that these three proceedings be argued together, and Patent Owner has indicated in its contingent request for oral argument that Patent Owner agrees with this approach. Paper 24 at 3.

Petitioner respectfully requests a total of two (2) hours to present its arguments, with the opportunity to reserve a portion of its time for rebuttal. Petitioner proposes to present its arguments in IPR2014-00649 regarding U.S. Patent No. 7,548,037 first because the Board has not yet heard arguments regarding this patent. Petitioner would then present its arguments in IPR2014-00648 regarding U.S. Patent No. 8,217,612 and in IPR2014-00650 regarding U.S. Patent No. 7,579,802. Those patents were addressed in a combined argument involving a different petitioner on April 30, 2015.

With respect to this proceeding (IPR2014-00650), Petitioner intends to argue the instituted grounds of unpatentability, namely that:

- A. Claims 15 and 16 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Itoh and Kinzl;
- B. Claim 11 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over

Itoh, Kinzl, and Jones;

C. Claims 1, 6–9, 15, and 16 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Lamm and Itoh;

D. Claim 11 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Lamm, Itoh, and Duhamé; and

E. Claims 1, 7–9, 11, 15, and 16 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Duhamé and Kinzl.

In addressing these grounds of unpatentability, Petitioner intends to address the constructions of the claim terms at issue in this proceeding: the meaning of “a sensor for measuring a parameter of a motor that varies in response to a resistance to motion” in claim 1, and the meaning of “a travel path” in claims 7 and 15, the meaning of “in response to a specified input the controller conducts a calibration motor energization sequence to determine parameters of object” in claim 11, and the meaning of “a logic unit” in claim 15. Petitioner also would address the reasons for combining references under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and Patent Owner’s challenges to enablement. Finally, Petitioner would address its motion to exclude being filed concurrently.

Petitioner requests that a projector and screen, or alternative means to display files from a laptop computer, be made available for use at the oral argument.

Dated: May 26, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles H. Sanders/

Charles H. Sanders

Reg. No.: 47,053

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's Request for Oral Argument was served on May 26, 2015, by email directed to the attorneys of record for Patent Owner at the following addresses:

Monte L. Falcoff (mlfalcoff@hdp.com)
Hemant M. Keskar (hkeskar@hdp.com)
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Dated: May 26, 2015

/Charles H. Sanders/
Charles H. Sanders
Reg. No.: 47,053