

Filed on behalf of: Google Inc.

By:
James J. Elacqua
james.elacqua@skadden.com
(650) 470-4510

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Google Inc.
Petitioner,
v.
Network-1 Technologies, Inc.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00345
U.S. Patent 8,205,237

GOOGLE'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Petitioner Google Inc. (“Google”) requests oral argument under 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a) and the Board’s June 23, 2015 Scheduling Order (Paper 7). Oral argument is scheduled for March 9, 2016. (Paper 7, at 5.)

Google specifies the following issues to be argued based on all admissible evidence of record (including expert testimony):

1. The proper interpretation of the Board’s claim construction of “approximate nearest neighbor”;
2. Whether claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15-16, 21-25, 29-30, 33, and 37-38 of U.S. Patent No. 8,205,237 (the “’237 patent”) are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Iwamura (Ex. 1012, U.S. Patent No. 6,188,010);
3. Whether claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, and 21-24 of the ’237 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Ghias (Ex. 1010, U.S. Patent No. 5,874,686);
4. Whether claims 26-27 and 34-35 of the ’237 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Iwamura and Chen (Ex. 1008, U.S. Patent No. 7,444,353); and
5. All other issues briefed with respect to the instituted grounds of unpatentability of the ’237 patent.

In light of the substantial overlap of prior art references and issues between

proceedings IPR2015-00343, IPR2015-00345, IPR2015-00347, and IPR2015-00348, Google requests a single consolidated hearing for the four proceedings. The parties have met and conferred on this issue, and Google understands that Patent Owner Network-1 Technologies, Inc. agrees to a single consolidated hearing. However, the parties do not agree on the time that should be allotted for argument. Based on the limited number of issues and references that remain in dispute between the parties, Google requests that the Board allot each party 30 minutes of argument covering all four proceedings.

The parties have also met and conferred regarding the exchange of demonstratives, and have agreed to exchange such materials on February 24. The parties will file demonstratives and objections with the Board pursuant to the Board's instructions in its order setting the oral argument.

Google requests the use of a projector capable of displaying PowerPoint slides.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: February 1, 2016

/s/ James J. Elacqua
James J. Elacqua (Lead Counsel)
USPTO Reg. No. 28,412
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &
Flom LLP
525 University Avenue
Suite 1400
Palo Alto, California 94301
Tel: (650) 470-4510
Fax: (650) 798-6564

Email: James.Elacqua@skadden.com

Douglas R. Nemec (Back-Up Counsel)

USPTO Reg. No. 41,219

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher &

Flom LLP

Four Times Square

New York, NY 10036

Tel: (212) 735-3000

Fax: (917) 777-2419

Email: Douglas.Nemec@skadden.com

§ 42.6(e) - CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.6(e) and 42.105 on the Patent Owner of a copy of this GOOGLE'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT by email at the corresponding address of record for Patent Owner's counsel in IPR2015-00345:

Charles R. Macedo (Reg. No. 32,781)
Brian A. Comack (Reg. No. 45,343)
Amster, Rothstein & Ebenstein LLP
90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
Telephone: (212) 336-8074
Facsimile: (212) 336-8001
E-mail: cmacedo@arelaw.com
N1-Google-IPR@arelaw.com

Greg Dovel (*pro hac vice*)
Dovel & Luner LLP
201 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 600
Santa Monica, CA 90941
Telephone: (310) 656-7066
E-mail: greg@dovellaw.com

Marc A. Fenster
Brian D. Ledahl
Russ, August & Kabat LLP
12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
Telephone: (310) 826-7474
Email: mfenster@raklaw.com
bledahl@raklaw.com

Dated: February 1, 2016

/James J. Elacqua/
James J. Elacqua (Reg. # 28,412)

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER
GOOGLE INC.