

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SONY CORPORATION, SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS (USA) INC.,
SONY MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS AB & SONY MOBILE
COMMUNICATIONS INC.

Petitioners

v.

CREATIVE TECHNOLOGY LIMITED

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2016-01407

Patent No. 6,928,433

PETITIONERS' REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING

Petitioners, Sony Corporation, Sony Mobile Communications (USA) Inc., Sony Mobile Communications AB & Sony Mobile Communications Inc., by and through their attorneys, respectfully request oral argument, currently scheduled for August 29, 2017. Petitioners request a total of 45 minutes to present their arguments, and request the ability to reserve a portion of their total time for presenting arguments after Patent Owner's presentation.

Pursuant to the Board's request in the Scheduling Order (Paper 14), directing the parties to state their preference regarding the location of the hearing, Petitioners state as follows:

- Petitioners have a general preference (for the convenience of Petitioners' outside and in-house counsel, who are based in Boston, New York, and New Jersey) that the hearing be held at the USPTO main office in Alexandria, Virginia.
- However, Petitioners would prefer the location most convenient for the members of the panel so that as many of the panel members as possible may participate in-person.
- If Denver is more convenient for the members of the panel to participate in-person, Petitioners would prefer that the hearing take place in Denver.
- Petitioners and Patent Owner met and conferred but were unable to come to an agreement on a preference for the hearing location.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R § 42.70, and without intending to waive any issue not specifically identified, Petitioners identify the following issues to be argued:

1. Obviousness of claims 2, 3, 5, and 7 under U.S.C. § 103 over Birrell and Seidensticker;
2. Obviousness of claims 19, 21, and 25 under U.S.C. § 103 over Birrell, Seidensticker, and Proehl;
3. Obviousness of claims 23 and 27 under U.S.C. § 103 over Birrell, Seidensticker, Proehl, and Johnson;
4. Obviousness of claims 17 and 18 under U.S.C. § 103 over Birrell, Seidensticker, and Looney;
5. Obviousness of claims 20, 22, and 26 under U.S.C. § 103 over Birrell, Seidensticker, Proehl, and Looney;
6. Obviousness of claims 24 and 28 under U.S.C. § 103 over Birrell, Seidensticker, Proehl, Johnson, and Looney;
7. Any issue identified in Patent Owner's Request for Oral Argument;
8. Any other issues raised in papers yet to be filed, such as a Motion for Observation Regarding Cross-Examination of Reply Witness; and
9. Any other issues the Board deems necessary to consider for issuing a Final Written Decision.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 24, 2017

By: /s/ Michael N. Rader
Michael N. Rader, Reg. No. 52,146
Randy J. Pritzker, Reg. No. 35,986
Andrew J. Tibbetts, Reg. No. 65,139
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 Atlantic Ave.
Boston, MA 02210-2206
Tel: 617-646-8000 / Fax: 617-646-8646

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.6 (e)(4)

I certify that on July 24, 2017, I will cause a copy of the foregoing document, including any exhibits or appendices referred to therein, to be served via electronic mail, as previously consented to by Patent Owner, upon the following:

Jonathan D. Baker
Russell Swerdon

JBaker@farneydaniels.com
russ_swerdon@creativelabs.com
CreativeZen@farneydaniels.com

Date: July 24, 2017

/MacAulay S. Rush/
Patent Paralegal
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.