

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APTIV SERVICES US, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

MICROCHIP TECHNOLOGY INC,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2024-00646
U.S. Patent No. 9,471,074

PATENT OWNER'S REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.70(a) and the Board’s Scheduling Order (Paper 12), Microchip Technology Inc. (“Patent Owner”), respectfully requests the opportunity to present oral argument regarding the patentability of the challenged claims of U.S. Pat. 9,471,074 (*see* Institution Decision (Paper 11)). Patent Owner requests oral argument on all instituted grounds, including the following:

- Whether Petitioner has established a prima facie case of obviousness;
- Rebuttal to Petitioner’s presentation on all matters;
- Any other issues raised by the parties in the papers and all exhibits (including declarations and depositions) filed in this proceeding;¹ and
- Any other issues that the Board deems necessary for issuing a final written decision.

The Board has currently scheduled Oral Argument for June 27, 2025. *See* Scheduling Order, 13. Per the Scheduling Order (pgs. 7-8), Patent Owner respectfully requests an in-person hearing at the USPTO regional office in San Jose, California. Patent Owner also requests permission to use a computer and screen to display demonstratives and exhibits.

If the San Jose location is unavailable, Patent Owner requests that Oral

¹ There is currently one motion pending: Patent Owner’s Motion to Strike (Paper 27).

Argument be held remotely. In the event that the Board grants a remote hearing, Petitioner requests permission to use the screen-sharing feature of Zoom (or equivalent) to display demonstratives and exhibits.

Patent Owner proposes that each side be allocated 45 minutes for argument, inclusive of any reply or sur-reply argument. In light of the Board's guidance in its Institution Decision (Paper 11) and the nature of the arguments presented, Patent Owner believes this will provide sufficient time to address the issues.

Consistent with the Trial Practice Guide, Patent Owner met and conferred with Petitioner about this request. Patent Owner understands that Petitioner will also be requesting 45 minutes argument time per side and that the hearing be held in-person in San Jose.

If helpful, Patent Owner is available at the Board's convenience to discuss the scheduling and format of the oral argument.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 14, 2025

/Travis Jensen/

Travis Jensen, Reg. No. 60,087
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA
94025-1015

Counsel for Patent Owner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on May 14, 2025, a copy of the following was served in its entirety via electronic mail, upon the following attorneys of record for Petitioner:

Alex S. Yap Mehran Arjomand Bryan Blumenkopf Stephen Liu MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 707 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 6000 Los Angeles, CA 90017	ayap@mofo.com marjomand@mofo.com bblumen@mofo.com sliu@mofo.com Aptiv-Microchip-PTAB@mofo.com
---	--

/Karen Johnson/
Karen Johnson