

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UMICORE AG & CO. KG

Petitioner

v.

BASF CORPORATION

Patent Owner

Case IPR2015-01124

U.S. Patent 8,404,203

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a), Petitioner Umicore AG & CO. KG (“Umicore”) hereby respectfully requests oral argument, as currently scheduled for July 28, 2016. Petitioner believes that the issues implicated by Cases IPR2015-1121, -1123, -1124, and -1125 can be addressed collectively at a single hearing. Petitioner respectfully requests that each side be allotted 2 hours to present its arguments regarding all four IPRs. Petitioner believes the following issues should be argued:

- I. All instituted grounds in IPR2015-1121:
 - A. Whether claims 1–8 and 30 of the ’662 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the combination of Zones and Maeshima; and
 - B. Whether claims 12–24 and 32–50 of the ’662 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the combination of Zones, Maeshima, and Patchett.
- II. All instituted grounds in IPR2015-1123:
 - A. Whether claims 1, 14, 15, 17–22, 26, and 27 of the ’203 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Zones and Maeshima; and

B. Whether claims 2–13, 16, 23–25, and 28–31 of the '203 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Zones, Maeshima, and Patchett.

III. All instituted grounds in IPR2015-1124:

A. Whether claims 1, 14, 15, 19, 20, 26, and 27 of the '203 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Maeshima and Breck;

B. Whether claims 2–13, 16, 23–25, and 28–31 of the '203 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Maeshima, Breck, and Patchett;

C. Whether claims 1, 14, 15, 19, 20, 26, and 27 of the '203 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Dedecek and Breck; and

D. Whether claims 2–13, 16, 23–25, and 28–31 of the '203 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Dedecek, Breck, and Patchett.

IV. All instituted grounds in IPR2015-1125:

A. Whether claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 30 of the '662 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the combination of Maeshima and Breck;

- B. Whether claims 12–24 and 32–38 of the '662 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the combination of Maeshima, Breck, and Patchett;
 - C. Whether claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 30 of the '662 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the combination of Dedecek and Breck; and
 - D. Whether claims 12–24 and 32–38 of the '662 patent are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over the combination of Dedecek, Breck, and Patchett.
- V. The issues raised by Petitioner's motion to exclude.
- VI. Rebuttal on other matters properly before the Board.

Petitioner also respectfully requests to use audio visual equipment to display possible demonstrative exhibits, including the use of a projector and screen.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 6/20/2016

/ Elizabeth Gardner /
Elizabeth Gardner (Reg. No. 36,519)
Orrick, Herrington, & Sutcliffe LLP
51 West 52nd Street
New York, NY 10019
Tel: 212-506-5000
Fax: 212-506-5151
Email: egardner@orrick.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby confirms that the foregoing PETITIONER'S
REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT was served on June 20, 2016 via e-mail
upon the following counsel of record for Patent Owner:

Brian E. Ferguson (brian.ferguson@weil.com)
Anish R. Desai (anish.desai@weil.com)
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
1300 Eye Street, NW Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005

/ Elizabeth Gardner /

Elizabeth Gardner (Reg. No. 36,519)
Orrick, Herrington, & Sutcliffe LLP
51 West 52nd Street
New York, NY 10019
Tel: 212-506-5000
Fax: 212-506-5151
Email: egardner@orrick.com