

**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*.

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT**

Case IPR2014-00730  
Petitioner's Request for Oral Argument

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a) and the Board's Scheduling Order (Paper 9), Petitioners Parrot S.A. and Parrot, Inc. (collectively "Petitioner") respectfully request oral argument, currently scheduled for July 1, 2015, on the issues raised in the Petition, in the Board's Institution Decision, Patent Owner's Response, Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Response, Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude (if filed), and Petitioner's Opposition to Patent Owner's Motion to Exclude (if filed).

Petitioner respectfully requests one (1) hour of time for oral argument on all issues raised in the parties' filings, including without limitation the following:

1. Whether claims 1-15 of the '071 patent are unpatentable in view of the cited prior art on the grounds instituted in the Board's Decision of Institution, Paper 7, including the following:
2. Whether claims 1-5 and 10-14 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by Smith (Ex. 1002, U.S. Patent No. 5,043,646);
3. Whether claims 6 and 7 are rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by the combination of prior art references Smith (Ex. 1002, U.S. Patent No. 5,043,646) and Barr (Ex. 1005, U.S. Patent No. 7,219,861);
4. Whether claims 8 and 9 are rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by the combination of prior art references Smith (Ex. 1002) and Fouche (Ex. 1006, U.S. 6,751,529); and,

Case IPR2014-00730  
Petitioner's Request for Oral Argument

5. Whether claim 15 is rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 by the combination of prior art references Smith (Ex. 1002), Spirov (Ex. 1007, U.S. App. Pub. 2006/0144994), Bathiche (Ex. 1008, U.S. Patent No. 7,145,551), and Shkolnikov (Ex. 1009, U.S. App. Pub. No. 2004/0263479).

6. Issues raised in any other party filing.

7. Issues raised in oral argument.

8. Any issue the Board deems necessary.

Petitioner requests authorization to use audio visual equipment to display possible demonstratives and exhibits, including the use of a computer, projector, and screen during oral argument.

Dated: May 27, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Hopenfeld/

James E. Hopenfeld (Reg No. 47,661)

Hopenfeld@oshaliang.com

Tammy J. Terry (Reg No. 69,167)

Terry@oshaliang.com

**OSHA LIANG LLP**

909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500

Houston, Texas 77010

Tel: 713-228-8600/Fax: 713-228-8778

*Counsel for Petitioner*

Case IPR2014-00730  
Petitioner's Request for Oral Argument

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies service pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e) on the Patent Owner by email and U.S. Mail a copy of the Petitioner's Request for Oral Argument as follows:

Gene Tabachnick  
James Dilmore  
gtabachnick@beckthomas.com  
jdilmore@beckthomas.com  
docket@beckthomas.com  
BECK & THOMAS, P.C.  
1575 McFarland Road, Suite 100  
Pittsburgh, PA 15216-1808

Dated: May 27, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

*/James E. Hopenfeld/*

James E. Hopenfeld (Reg No. 47,661)

Hopenfeld@oshaliang.com

Tammy J. Terry (Reg No. 69,167)

Terry@oshaliang.com

**OSHA LIANG LLP**

909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500

Houston, Texas 77010

Tel: 713-228-8600/Fax: 713-228-8778

***Counsel for Petitioner***