UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARISTA NETWORKS, INC., Petitioner

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., Patent Owner

Case IPR2016-00309 Patent 7,224,668

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING

A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

DOCKET

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a), Petitioner, Arista Networks, Inc., submits this Request for Oral Argument of claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15-28, 30, 31, 33-36, 55-64, 66, 67, and 69-72 of U.S. Patent No. 7,224,668 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) on all instituted grounds. The Board has scheduled Oral Hearing for March 7, 2017, on the same day as the Oral Hearings in IPR2016-00303 (involving U.S. Patent No. 6,377,577 ("577 patent")), IPR2016-00306 (involving U.S. Patent No. 7,023,853 ("853 patent")), and IPR2016-00308 (involving U.S. Patent No. 7,162,537 ("537 patent")). *See* Paper 9 at 7; IPR2016-00306, Paper 9 at 7.

Given the scope and complexity of the issues in these four proceedings, Petitioner requests no more than 3.5 hours per side of oral argument time for all four IPRs, with each side deciding the amount of time to allocate to each IPR. In addition, Petitioner proposes that the Hearings proceed in the following manner:

- Petitioner's opening argument on the '577 and '853 patents;
- Patent Owner's responsive argument on the '577 and '853 patents;
- Petitioner's reply argument on the '577 and '853 patents;
- Petitioner's opening argument on the '668 patent;
- Patent Owner's responsive argument on the '668 patent;
- Petitioner's reply argument on the '668 patent;
- Petitioner's opening argument on the '537 patent;
- Patent Owner's responsive argument on the '537 patent;

• Petitioner's reply argument on the '537 patent.

Petitioner believes that proceeding in this order would be most efficient because the '577 and '853 patents are genealogically related to each other. The '668 patent and '537 patent are not related to each other or to the '577 or '853 patents.

Finally, Petitioner's preference for the location of the Oral Hearings is in the West Coast Regional Office, in San Jose, California. Both Petitioner and Patent Owner are located in that area. Petitioner has reached out to Patent Owner with respect to this issue and has learned that Patent Owner would prefer to have the Hearing at the USPTO main office in Alexandria, Virginia.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 27, 2017

<u>/s/Lauren A. Degnan</u> Lauren A. Degnan Reg. No. 40,584

Customer Number 26171 Fish & Richardson P.C. Telephone: (612) 337-2508 Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to 37 CFR § 42.6(e)(4), the undersigned certifies that on January 27, 2017, a complete and entire copy of this Petitioner's Request for Oral Hearing provided via email to the Petitioner by serving the correspondence email address of record as follows:

Jon E. Wright Robert Greene Sterne Lori A. Gordon Daniel S. Block Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C. 1100 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20005

Email: jwright-PTAB@skgf.com Email: rsterne-PTAB@skgf.com Email: lgordon-PTAB@skgf.com Email: dblock-PTAB@skgf.com Email: ptab@skgf.com

/Edward G. Faeth/

Edward G. Faeth Fish & Richardson P.C. 3200 RBC Plaza 60 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 (202) 626-6420

DOCKF