

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

**MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC**  
Petitioner,

v.

Patent of **MICHAEL ARNOUSE**  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2013-00010 (MPT)  
Patent 7,516,484

---

Before MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, *Lead Administrative Patent Judge*,<sup>1</sup> and  
JONI Y. CHANG, and JENNIFER S. BISK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

**DECISION - Motion for  
*Pro Hac Vice Admission – 37 C.F.R. § 42.10***

---

<sup>1</sup> Judge Tierney serves as lead judge of the Board's Trial Section.

Motorola Mobility LLC (“Motorola”) filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Steven D. Moore. (Paper 12.) The motion is unopposed. For the reasons provided below, the motion is *granted*.

As set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), the Board may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner. In authorizing Motorola’s motion for *pro hac vice*, the Board also required a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in this proceeding. (Paper 6.)<sup>2</sup>

In its motion, Motorola states that there is good cause for Mr. Moore’s admission because: (1) Mr. Moore is an experienced litigator and has been involved in numerous patent infringement litigations; and (2) as lead counsel for Motorola in the co-pending litigation between Motorola and the Patent Owner, Mr. Moore has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding. In support of the motion, Mr. Moore attests to these facts in his affidavit with sufficient explanations.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, the motion and Mr. Moore’s affidavit comply with the requirements set forth in the Board’s order authorizing Motorola’s motion for *pro hac vice* admission.

---

<sup>2</sup> Paper 6 is labeled Document 7 in PRPS.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Moore’s affidavit and biography should have been filed as separate exhibits and labeled properly. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63.

Based on the record, we find that Mr. Moore has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Motorola in the instant proceeding. We further recognize that there is a need for Motorola to have its lead counsel in the co-pending litigation involved in this proceeding. Accordingly, Motorola has established that there is good cause for Mr. Moore's admission.

For the foregoing reasons, it is

**ORDERED** that Motorola's motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Steven Moore for the instant proceeding is ***granted***;

**FURTHER ORDERED** that Motorola is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel for the instant proceeding; and

**FURTHER ORDERED** that Mr. Moore is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of the C.F.R., and to be subject to the Office's Code of Professional Responsibility set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 10.20 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

PETITIONER:

Ko-Fang Chang  
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP  
kchang@kilpatricktownsend.com

Case IPR2013-00010 (MPT)  
Patent 7,516,484

PATENT OWNER:

Lawrence H, Meier, esq.  
DOWNS RACHLIN MARTIN PLLC  
lmeier@drm.com