

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RAVIN CROSSBOWS, LLC,

Petitioner

v.

MCP IP, LLC,

Patent Owner

Case No. IPR2024-00522

U.S. Patent No. 8,683,989 B2

PETITIONER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Pursuant to the Board's September 12, 2024, Scheduling Order (Paper 10), Petitioner respectfully requests oral argument for the trial currently scheduled on June 12, 2025. Petitioner requests oral argument for this IPR (IPR2024-00522) to be consolidated with oral argument for IPR2024-00523 and IPR2024-00524 (for which the Requests for Oral Argument are being concurrently filed). The evidence, arguments, and issues between the three proceedings overlap significantly and the Parties believe they can address all three petitions in a single proceeding if the Board would be willing to extend the time for a single hearing. In that regard, the Parties conferred and agreed to a requested ninety (90) minutes of argument for each Party for a single, consolidated hearing for all three *Inter Partes* Reviews. Ravin also respectfully requests an in-person hearing at the Office's Alexandria, Washington location.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a), Petitioner specifies the following issues, without intent to waive consideration of any issue not requested, to be argued for this proceeding:

1. Whether Claims 1-4 and 7-19 are obvious under § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 8,205,607 B1 to Darlington ("*Darlington*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2008/0135032 A1 to Islas ("*Islas*");

2. Patent Owner's swear behind arguments as well as the evidence allegedly supporting those swear behind arguments including, but not limited to, the credibility of the testimony from Patent Owner's declarants.

3. Any claim constructions, unpatentability grounds, or other issues raised in the Petition, Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Amendment, or Petitioner Reply, the Patent Owner Preliminary Response, Patent Owner's Sur-Reply to Petitioner's Reply to Patent Owner's Preliminary Response, Patent Owner Response, Patent Owner Sur-Reply, or the Board's Institution Decision;

4. Any issues regarding motions to exclude or motions to strike that may be filed or pending; and

5. Any issues otherwise raised by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

ERISE IP, P.A.

BY: /s/ Adam P. Seitz
Adam P. Seitz, Reg. No. 52,206
adam.seitz@eriseip.com
Erise IP, P.A.
7015 College Blvd., Suite 700
Overland Park, KS 66211
P: (913) 777-5600
F: (913) 777-5601

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE ON PATENT OWNER
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.6

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(e), the undersigned certifies that on May 1, 2025, the foregoing *Petitioner's Request for Oral Argument* was served via electronic filing with the Board and via Electronic Mail on the following practitioners of record for Patent Owner:

Joshua A. Griswold (IPR56402-00051P1@fr.com)

Kenneth Hoover (IPR56402-00051P1@fr.com)

Carl E. Bruce (IPR56402-00051P1@fr.com)

Matthew A. Colvin (IPR56402-00051P1@fr.com)

/s/ Adam P. Seitz

Adam P. Seitz, Reg. No. 52,206