IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Parrot S.A. and Parrot, Inc.

Petitioners,

v.

Drone Technologies, Inc.

Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00730
U.S. Patent No. 7,584,071

Before HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, and CHRISTOPHER M. KAISER, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. HOPENFELD IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO CORRECT EXHIBIT TO PETITION FOR *INTER PARTES* REVIEW 37 C.F.R. § 42.104(c)

PARROT EXHIBIT 1013
Parrot, Inc. v. Drone Technologies, Inc.

I, James E. Hopenfeld, do hereby declare and state, that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and correct and all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true and correct; and further that the statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under the laws of the United States of America.

Dated: February 9, 2015

1. I am a Partner at Osha Liang LLP and represent Petitioners Parrot S.A and Parrot, Inc. (collectively, "Parrot" or "Petitioner"). I am also lead counsel in IPR2014-00730 and IPR2014-00732.

2. Due to clerical errors in the assembly of certain exhibits in both proceedings, Petitioner is seeking authorization to file corrected exhibits.

3. Exhibit 1010 to the Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,584,071 is the declaration of Prof. Raffaello D'Andrea, in which he sets forth his opinions of unpatentability of the claims of the '071 patent. On behalf of Osha Liang LLP I prepared and represented Prof. D'Andrea at his deposition in this proceeding, which occurred on January 8, 2015.

4. In the course of preparing for the deposition, I learned that Prof. D'Andrea's CV was inadvertently not included in the declaration in Exhibit 1010 when it was filed, even though the declaration clearly describes the CV and refers to it as being attached as "Appendix B" to the declaration. Upon further investigation, I learned this was an error that was made during the assembly of the exhibit prior to filing in PRPS, as we had received Prof. D'Andrea's CV for his declaration prior to the time of filing the IPR petitions.

5. The above-described recently-discovered clerical error was unintentional, is being promptly corrected, and has not caused any prejudice or harm to Patent Owner. Indeed, it was not until Patent Owner's counsel sent a letter

dated January 22, 2015, that it became apparent that Patent Owner intended to challenge Prof. D'Andrea's declaration in the related proceeding (IPR2014-00732) on the basis of a clerical error. Although under no obligation to do so, Petitioner immediately investigated the issue and, on January 26, served copies of corrected versions of the exhibits on Patent Owner.