Paper 43

Entered: October 30, 2013

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_

#### BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

\_\_\_\_

# MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC Petitioner,

V.

## ARNOUSE DIGITAL DEVICES CORPORATION Patent Owner.

Case IPR2013-00010 Patent 7,516,484

Before MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, Administrative Patent Judges.

TIERNEY, Administrative Patent Judge.

ORDER Trial Hearing 37C.F.R. §42.70



A conference call was held to discuss whether the Board should grant

Petitioner's request for final hearing. Patent Owner opposed the request.

Specifically, Patent Owner represented that a hearing would place an undue

financial burden on the Patent Owner, which is a small business. Patent Owner

further represented that this particular case has been sufficiently briefed such that

no hearing would be necessary for the Board to decide the merits of the case.

The Board stated that 35 U.S.C. § 315(a)(10) required the Office promulgate rules providing either party with the right to an oral hearing as part of the proceeding. The Board agreed with Patent Owner, however, that this particular case has been briefed sufficiently such that no prejudice would arise should a hearing not be held. The Board requested that Petitioner consider whether such a hearing would be necessary and if one were to be conducted, the Board indicated that the hearing would be conducted telephonically to reduce the financial burden on Patent Owner.

Petitioner subsequently contacted the Board and withdrew its request for an oral hearing.

It is:

Ordered that no oral hearing will be held in the proceeding and that the case will be decided on the briefs in due course.



Case IPR2013-00010 Patent 7,516,484

### PETITIONER:

Ko-Fang Chang <a href="kchang@kilpatricktownsend.com">kchang@kilpatricktownsend.com</a>

### PATENT OWNER:

Justin McCabe jmccabe@dunkielsaunders.com

Geoff Hand <a href="mailto:ghand@dunkielsaunders.com">ghand@dunkielsaunders.com</a>

