

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

Daedalus Prime LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01343
Patent 8,898,494

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Filed on behalf of Petitioner:
Celine Jimenez Crowson (Reg. No. 40,357)
Joseph J. Raffetto (Reg. No. 66,218)
Scott Hughes (Reg. No. 68,385)
Nicholas Rotz (Reg. No. 75,959)
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
555 13th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.637.5600
Facsimile: 202.637.5710

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a) and the Board’s Scheduling Order issued February 13, 2024 (Paper 8), Petitioner Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC (“**Petitioner**”)

respectfully requests oral argument in this proceeding for U.S. Patent No.

8,898,494 (the “**’494 Patent**”), currently scheduled for November 13, 2024.

Petitioner requests 60 minutes of argument per side, and that the oral argument

take place in person at the USPTO’s Alexandria, Virginia headquarters. The parties

have conferred and agree on the amount of time for oral argument, but do not agree on location.

Petitioner requests that the following issues to be argued in the proceeding:

- Whether claim 1 of the ’494 Patent is anticipated or rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 7,421,601 (“**Bose**”);
- Whether claim 2 of the ’494 Patent are rendered obvious by Bose in view of U.S. Patent No. 8,601,300 (“**Anderson**”);
- Whether claims 3, 14-15 of the ’494 Patent are rendered obvious by Bose in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,263,457 (“**White**”) and U.S. Patent Application No. 2009/0150689 (“**Simeral**”);
- Whether claim 13 of the ’494 Patent are rendered obvious by Bose in view of Anderson and U.S. Patent No. 8,510,582 (“**Naffziger**”);
- Whether claims 4, 7 of the ’494 Patent are rendered obvious by White;

- Whether claims 5-6 of the '494 Patent are rendered obvious by White in view of Anderson;
- Whether claims 17-18 of the '494 Patent are rendered obvious by White in view of Anderson and Naffziger;
- Whether claims 1, 3, 14-15 of the '494 Patent are rendered obvious by White in view of Simeral;
- Whether claim 2 of the '494 Patent are rendered obvious by White in view of Simeral and Anderson;
- Whether claim 13 of the '494 Patent are rendered obvious by White in view of Simeral and Anderson and Naffziger;
- Any issues Petitioner raised in its Petition and Reply to the Petition;
- Any issues Patent Owner raised in the Response and Sur-Reply to the Petition;
- Any issues specified by Patent Owner in its request for oral argument;
- Any issues raised in motions to exclude (if any), or any other motion or paper filed in this proceeding; and
- Any other issues that the Board deems necessary for issuing a Final Written Decision.

Petitioner also requests permission to use audio and visual equipment to display demonstratives and exhibits during the hearing.

Dated: October 1, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Scott Hughes

Celine Jimenez Crowson (Reg. No. 40,357)

Joseph J. Raffetto (Reg. No. 66,218)

Scott Hughes (Reg. No. 68,385)

Nicholas Rotz (Reg. No. 75,959)

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

555 13th Street N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.637.5600

Facsimile: 202.637.5710

Counsel for Petitioner

Certificate of Service

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), this is to certify that on this 1st day of October, 2024, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PETITIONER’S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT** by e-mail on the following parties (as agreed in the Patent Owner’s Mandatory Notice):

Tarek N. Fahmi (Lead Counsel)
Jonathan Tsao (Back-up Counsel)
Ascenda Law Group, PC
patents@ascendalaw.com

/s/ Ky-Yen Wong
Ky-Yen Wong
Hogan Lovells US LLP
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 3500
San Francisco, CA 94111