

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

HTC CORPORATION,  
HTC AMERICA, INC., and  
LG ELECTRONICS, INC.,<sup>1</sup>  
Petitioner,

v.

PARTHENON UNIFIED MEMORY ARCHITECTURE LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01500 (Patent 7,321,368 B2)  
Case IPR2015-01501 (Patent 7,777,753 B2)  
Case IPR2015-01502 (Patent 7,542,045 B2)<sup>2</sup>

---

Before JAMES B. ARPIN, MATTHEW R. CLEMENTS, and  
SUSAN L. C. MITCHELL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CLEMENTS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Denying Patent Owner's Unopposed Motions for  
*Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Justin Chen  
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

---

<sup>1</sup> Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and Samsung Electronics America, Inc., were terminated from this proceeding. *See, e.g.*, IPR2015-01500, Paper 28.

<sup>2</sup> This Order addresses issues pertaining to all three cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

IPR2015-01500 (Patent 7,321,368 B2)

IPR2015-01501 (Patent 7,777,753 B2)

IPR2015-01502 (Patent 7,542,045 B2)

As explained in the Notice According Filing Date (Paper 3), any motion for *pro hac vice* admission “shall be filed in accordance with the ‘Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission’ in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7.” That Order states that a motion for *pro hac vice* must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration attesting that “The individual will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set for in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et. seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).” *Unified Patents Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, 3 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013).

In our Order Granting Patent Owner’s Unopposed Motions for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Mr. Michael McBride and Mr. Amir Alavi, we observed that the declarations of Messrs. Alavi and McBride referred to the wrong rules, and we encouraged Patent Owner to refer to the correct rules in its next *pro hac vice* motion. Paper 20, 2 n.2. The Declaration of Mr. Justin Chen does not, however, refer to the correct rules. Ex. 2011 ¶ 7 (“I will be subject to the USPTO 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)).

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s unopposed motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Justin Chen is *denied* without prejudice.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> We now caution both parties that further failures to comply with our orders shall result in the denial of motions such as this, *with prejudice*. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.12(a)(1), (b)(2).

IPR2015-01500 (Patent 7,321,368 B2)

IPR2015-01501 (Patent 7,777,753 B2)

IPR2015-01502 (Patent 7,542,045 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Allan M. Soobert

Naveen Modi

PAUL HASTINGS LLP

Samsung-PUMA-IPR@paulhastings.com

Rajeev Gupta

Darren M. Jiron

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP

LGE\_Finnegan\_PUMAIPR@finnegan.com

Joseph A. Micallef

Stephen M. Everett

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

jmicallef@sidley.com

stephen.everett@sidley.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Masood Anjom

Scott Clark

AHMAD, ZAVITSANOS, ANAIPAKOS, ALAVI & MENSING P.C.

manjom@azalaw.com

sclark@azalaw.com