

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ALARM.COM INC.  
Petitioner

v.

VIVINT, INC.  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2016-00116  
U.S. Patent No. 6,147,601

---

**PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT**

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

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a), Petitioner Alarm.com Inc. hereby requests oral argument, currently scheduled for January 31, 2017, for case IPR2016-00116. *See* Scheduling Order, Paper 15 at p. 6. Petitioner further requests that this case be argued jointly with cases IPR2016-00161 and IPR2016-00173, which concern patents from the same family with common claim terms, present largely the same disputed issues, and which are also scheduled for oral argument on the same day. *See* IPR2016-00161, Paper 17 at p. 6; IPR2016-00173, Paper 15 at p. 6. Petitioner also requests that the hearing occur in Hearing Room A due to the number of counsel and client representatives anticipated in the three cases. Petitioner specifies the following issues to be argued, for all three cases (except for Issues 6 and 7 below):

1. That the Board has offered the broadest reasonable construction of the term “message profile containing outgoing message routing instructions”.
2. That Shetty rendered obvious user-defined message profiles.
3. That Shetty rendered obvious remote configuration or modification of user-defined message profiles.
4. That Shetty in view of Britton rendered obvious normal status messages.
5. That a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine features of Levac with Shetty.

6. That Shetty in view of Levac rendered obvious selection of different user-defined communication devices to receive outgoing exception messages at different time periods. (IPR 2016-00116 only)
7. That Shetty rendered obvious communication device identification codes stored in a second memory and configured in a plurality of user-defined message profiles. (IPR2016-00116 and IPR2016-00173 only)
8. Any issues specified by Patent Owner or raised by Patent Owner at the hearing.

Because these issues, with the exceptions of Issues 6 and 7 above, are common to each of the cases to be argued, Petitioner requests a total of ninety (90) minutes to address these issues in a single argument for all three cases combined.

In the event that the Board does not grant Petitioner's request to argue these cases in a single consolidated argument, Petitioner will need to present many of the same arguments in each case. In that event, Petitioner requests sixty (60) minutes of argument in the instant case.

Should Patent Owner argue any motions to exclude evidence in any of the cases, Petitioner requests an additional five (5) minutes, or an amount of time equivalent to Patent Owner's time spent arguing such motions, whichever is longer, to respond to those arguments.

Petitioner requests the ability to use a laptop projector, Elmo projector, and screen for the purposes of displaying demonstrative exhibits.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 20, 2016

By: / William H. Mandir /  
William H. Mandir  
Registration No. 32,156  
Lead Counsel for Petitioner

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the attached PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT was sent via electronic mail on December 20, 2016 to the following:

Robert G. Sterne ([rsterne-PTAB@skgf.com](mailto:rsterne-PTAB@skgf.com))  
Jason D. Eisenberg ([jasone-PTAB@skgf.com](mailto:jasone-PTAB@skgf.com))  
[PTAB@skgf.com](mailto:PTAB@skgf.com)  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX  
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

*Counsel of Record for the Patent Owner in this proceeding*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 20, 2016

By: /s/ Brian K. Shelton  
Brian K. Shelton  
Registration No. 50,245  
Backup Counsel for Petitioner