Filed on behalf of: Gold Standard Instruments, LLC

Paı	per	

By: Joseph A. Hynds, Lead Counsel Date filed: September 20, 2016

Steven Lieberman, Back-up Counsel (*Pro Hac Vice*)

C. Nichole Gifford, Back-up Counsel

R. Elizabeth Brenner-Leifer, Back-up Counsel

Derek F. Dahlgren, Back-up Counsel (Pro Hac Vice)

Jason M. Nolan, Back-up Counsel

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.

607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 800

Washington, DC 20005

Phone: 202-783-6040 | Facsimile: 202-783-6031

Emails: jhynds@rfem.com

slieberman@rfem.com ngifford@rfem.com

ebrenner@rothwellfigg.com

ddahlgren@rfem.com jnolan@rfem.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

US ENDODONTICS, LLC, Petitioner,

V.

GOLD STANDARD INSTRUMENTS, LLC, Patent Owner.

Case PGR2015-00019 Patent 8,876,991 B2

PATENT OWNER GOLD STANDARD INSTRUMENTS, LLC'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT



Mail Stop PATENT BOARD Patent Trial and Appeal Board U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Pursuant to the Scheduling Order, dated January 29, 2016 (Paper 18) and the Joint Stipulation Regarding Due Dates 4 and 5, filed August 30, 2016 (Paper 34), Patent Owner Gold Standard Instruments, LLC ("Patent Owner") respectfully requests oral argument, which is scheduled to be held on October 19, 2016.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a), Patent Owner identifies the following issues as among those to be argued:

- (1) Whether Petitioner has met its burden of proving claims 12–16 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of enablement;
- (2) Whether Petitioner has met its burden of proving claims 12–16 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of written description;
- (3) Whether Petitioner has met its burden of proving claims 12–16 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Luebke 2008;
- (4) Whether Petitioner has met its burden of proving claim 15 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Luebke 2008 alone or in view of Heath or ISO 3630-1;
- (5) Whether Petitioner has met its burden of proving claims 12–14 and 16 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Kuhn;



(6) Whether Petitioner has met its burden of proving claim 15 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kuhn alone or in view of Heath or ISO 3630-1; and (7) Any other issues raised in the Petition, Patent Owner's Preliminary Response, Patent Owner's Response, Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Response, Petitioner's Request for Oral Argument, or otherwise raised by the Patent Owner, Petitioner, or the Board.

Patent Owner requests the ability to use audio/visual equipment to display demonstrative exhibits, including the use of a projector and screen for PowerPoint or other visual display.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 20, 2016 By: / Joseph A. Hynds/

Joseph A. Hynds, Reg. No. 34,627 ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST &

MANBECK, P.C.

607 14th St., N.W., Suite 800

Washington, DC 20005

Phone: 202-783-6040 Facsimile: 202-783-6031

Counsel for Patent Owner

Gold Standard Instruments, LLC



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 20th day of September 2016, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PATENT OWNER GOLD STANDARD INSTRUMENTS, LLC'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT** was served, via electronic mail, upon the following counsel of record for Petitioner US Endodontics, LLC:

Jeffrey S. Ginsberg, Esq.
Abhishek Bapna, Esq.
Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-6710
Phone: 212-336-2000

Facsimile: 212-336-2222 Emails: jginsberg@pbwt.com abapna@pbwt.com

/ Erik van Leeuwen /

Erik van Leeuwen Litigation Operations Coordinator Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck, P.C.

