UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2023-00788
U.S. Patent No. 9,590,582

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70 and the Board's Scheduling Order (Paper 13), Patent Owner hereby requests oral argument. Patent Owner specifies the following issues to be argued for IPR2023-00788:

A. Are Claims 1-5 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 9,590,582 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Gonzalez?

B. Are Claims 1-5 and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 9,590,582 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Muh and Niknejad?

C. Issues related to the Board's Decision Instituting *Inter Partes* Review (Paper 12).

D. Any other outstanding motions and pleadings, and other issues that the Board deems necessary for issuing a Final Written Decision.

Patent Owner reserves the right to address any other arguments presented by Petitioner and any other issues about which the Board wishes to hear argument.

Patent Owner requests 30 minutes of argument time per-side to address the issues briefed to date and to respond to any other issues the Board deems necessary.

Patent Owner requests the use of audio/visual equipment including the use of a projector with HDMI connection and screen for display of electronic materials.

Pursuant to the Board's Order on the Conduct of the Proceeding (Paper 27), Patent Owner requests an in-person hearing at the San Jose, USPTO Regional Office. Counsel for Patent Owner conferred with counsel for Petitioner, and on May

13, 2024, counsel for Petitioner indicated that it intended to request an in-person hearing. Ex. 2008. Based on this representation, Patent Owner sought guidance from the Board regarding the location of such an in-person hearing, requesting the in-person hearing occur in Alexandria, VA. The Board indicated Alexandria was not available and identified both San Jose, CA and Dallas, TX as available options for an in-person hearing. Paper 27.

The most recent order governing the hearing (Paper 27) does not provide that the hearing must be virtual if either party elects to attend virtually. *Cf.* Paper 13 at 7 ("PTAB will only conduct an in-person hearing when requested by all parties.").

Counsel for Petitioner subsequently changed their intentions, and now indicate that they no longer intend to request an in-person hearing. Respectfully, Patent Owner still requests an in-person hearing in San Jose, CA. While counsel for Petitioner should be entitled to attend virtually, that decision should not prejudice Patent Owner's ability to appear in-person before the APJ located in San Jose, CA to defend the patentability of its claims.

Patent Owner expects 7 individuals will attend the hearing on behalf of Patent Owner, a mix of counsel of record and client representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 10, 2024

By: /Jason A. Engel/

Jason A. Engel
Reg. No. 51,654
K&L Gates LLP
70 W. Madison Street, Suite 3100
Chicago, IL 60602
Jason.Engel.PTAB@klgates.com
T: (312) 807-4236

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 10, 2024, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing to be served on the following counsel of record for Petitioner by electronic mail to the following addresses:

Brian E. Ferguson
Robert T. Vlasis III
Joseph C. Masullo
Winston & Strawn LLP
1901 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Email: beferguson@winston.com
Email: rvlasis@winston.com
Email: jmasullo@winston.com

Chaoxuan Charles Liu
Winston & Strawn LLP
2121 North Pearl Street, Ste. 900
Dallas, TX 75201
Email: ccliu@winston.com

Louis L. Campbell
Winston & Strawn LLP
255 Shoreline Drive, Ste. 520
Redwood City, CA 94065
Email: llcampbell@winston.com
Email: AMD-IPR@winston.com

By: /Jason A. Engel/
Jason A. Engel
Reg. No. 51,654