

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PRONG, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

YEOSHUA SORIAS,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01317  
Patent 8,712,486 B2

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, GLENN J. PERRY, and  
KIMBERLY McGRAW, Administrative Patent Judges.

McGRAW, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER

Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Nathan D. Renov  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)*

Petitioner filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Nathan D. Renov. Paper 20. During a conference call with the Board on February 26, 2016, Patent Owner indicated it would not oppose Petitioner's motion. For the reasons provided below, Petitioner's 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. For example, where the lead counsel is a registered practitioner, a non-registered practitioner may be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* "upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding." 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). In authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board also requires a statement of facts showing there is good cause to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*, and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in this proceeding.

In its motion, Petitioner asserts that there is good cause for Mr. Renov's *pro hac vice* admission because: (1) Mr. Renov is an experienced litigation attorney and has over six years of patent prosecution support and patent litigation support experience; (2) Mr. Renov has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this *inter partes* proceeding. Paper 20 at 2; Ex. 1028 ¶¶ 10, 11. In support of the motion, Mr. Renov attests to these facts in his declaration with sufficient explanations, attests to being member in good standing of the Bar of New York, and otherwise attests to the requirements for *pro hac vice* admission outlined in *Motorola*

IPR2015-01317  
Patent 8,712,486 B2

*Mobility LLC v. Patent of Michael Arnouse*, IPR2013-00010 Oct. 15, 2012 (Paper 6). *See* Ex. 1028.

Based upon consideration of the motion and the record before us, we grant Petitioner's Motion for Admission of Mr. Renov.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner's motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Renov for the instant proceeding, to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel, is granted;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in the instant proceeding; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Renov is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Title 37, Part 42 of the C.F.R., and to be subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*; and

FURTHER ORDERED that, if not already done, Petitioner shall file an updated Mandatory Notice and Power of Attorney within one week of the date of this Order.

IPR2015-01317  
Patent 8,712,486 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Caleb Pollack  
Zeev Pearl  
Daniel Melman  
PEARL COHEN ZEDEK LATZER BARATZ LLP  
[cpollack@pearlcohen.com](mailto:cpollack@pearlcohen.com)  
[zpearl@pearlcohen.com](mailto:zpearl@pearlcohen.com)  
[dmelman@pearlcohen.com](mailto:dmelman@pearlcohen.com)

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Mitchell S. Feller  
Jason Wachter  
GOTTLIEB RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.  
[msfeller@grr.com](mailto:msfeller@grr.com)  
[jwachter@grr.com](mailto:jwachter@grr.com)