

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SL CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

ADAPTIVE HEADLAMP TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-00193  
Patent 7,241,034 C1

---

Before MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, RAMA G. ELLURU, and  
SCOTT C. MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER  
Granting Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice*  
Admission of Adam P. Samansky  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.10*

Petitioner moves to have Mr. Adam P. Samansky admitted *pro hac vice* in this proceeding. Paper 14. Petitioner submitted a declaration from Mr. Samansky in support of this motion. Ex. 1028. Patent Owner did not file an opposition to Petitioner's motion in the requisite time.

Based on the facts set forth in the motion and the accompanying declaration, we conclude that Mr. Samansky has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Petitioner in this proceeding, that Mr. Samansky has demonstrated the necessarily familiarity with the subject matter of this proceeding, and that there is a need for Petitioner to be represented by counsel who has experience litigating the challenged patent. Accordingly, Petitioner has established good cause for the admission of Mr. Samansky *pro hac vice*. Mr. Samansky will be permitted to serve as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

Accordingly, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner's motion to admit Mr. Adam P. Samansky *pro hac vice* (Paper 14) is granted, and Mr. Samansky is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in this proceeding;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Samansky 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 Code of Federal Regulations; and

Case IPR2016-00193  
Patent 7,241,034 C1

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Samansky is subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*

For PETITIONER:

David Cotta  
Peter Cuomo  
Kongsik Kim  
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC  
[dcotta@mintz.com](mailto:dcotta@mintz.com)  
[PJCuomo@mintz.com](mailto:PJCuomo@mintz.com)  
[KKim@mintz.com](mailto:KKim@mintz.com)

For PATENT OWNER:

Brett Pinkus  
FRIEDMAN, SUDER & COOKE  
[pinkus@fsclaw.com](mailto:pinkus@fsclaw.com)