Trials@uspto.gov 571-272-7822 Paper 26 Entered: May 19, 2016

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

# BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SIERRA WIRELESS AMERICA, INC., SIERRA WIRELESS, INC., and RPX CORP., Petitioner,

v.

M2M SOLUTIONS LLC, Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01823 Patent 8,648,717 B2

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, JUSTIN T. ARBES, and DANIEL J. GALLIGAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GALLIGAN, Administrative Patent Judge.

### DECISION

Petitioner's Motion for Withdrawal of Robert E. Krebs and for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Ronald F. Lopez 37 C.F.R. § 42.10

LARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

On May 9, 2016, pursuant to our authorization, Petitioner filed a Motion to withdraw Mr. Robert E. Krebs as back-up counsel and to have Mr. Ronald F. Lopez admitted *pro hac vice*. Paper 23.<sup>1</sup> The Motion states that there is no change in lead counsel for Petitioner and that Patent Owner does not oppose the Motion. *Id.* at 1, 3. Petitioner's Motion is *granted*. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), (e); *see also Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Order Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission, Paper 7 (October 15, 2003) (setting forth requirements for *pro hac vice* admission).<sup>2</sup>

It is

RM

ORDERED that Mr. Krebs is no longer recognized as counsel for Petitioner in this proceeding;

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for *pro hac vice* admission is *granted*, and Mr. Lopez is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in IPR2015-01823;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Lopez is to comply with the Office

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Petitioner also filed an affidavit of Mr. Lopez in support of the Motion (Paper 24). We note that Petitioner filed the affidavit of Mr. Lopez as a paper in this case, rather than as a separate exhibit. The parties are cautioned that, going forward, such evidence should be filed as an exhibit. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(a) ("Evidence consists of affidavits, transcripts of depositions, documents, and things. All evidence must be filed in the form of an exhibit.").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Available at http://www.uspto.gov/patents-application-process/appealing-patent-decisions/decisions-and-opinions/representative-orders.

IPR2015-01823 Patent 8,648,717 B2

Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Title 37, Part 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations, and that Mr. Lopez is 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*.

# For PETITIONER:

Jennifer Hayes Robert Krebs Nixon Peabody LLP jenhayes@nixonpeabody.com rkrebs@nixonpeabody.com

### For PATENT OWNER:

Jeffrey Costakos Michelle Moran Foley & Lardner LLP jcostakos@foley.com mmoran@foley.com