Paper No. 20

Entered: February 16, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC., Petitioner,

v.

PARTHENON UNIFIED MEMORY ARCHITECTURE LLC, Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01114 (Patent 7,777,753 B2) Case IPR2016-01121 (Patent 5,960,464) Case IPR2016-01135 (Patent 5,812,789)¹

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

ZECHER, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION

Granting Petitioner's Unopposed Motions for *Pro Hac Vice*Admission of Mr. Yakov Zolotorev

37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)

¹ This Decision addresses an issue that is identical in all three cases. We, therefore, exercise our discretion to issue one Decision to be filed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this style heading in any subsequent papers.



I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, Apple Inc. ("Apple"), filed a Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Mr. Yakov Zolotorev in each of the proceedings identified above. Paper 20 ("Mot.").² Patent Owner, Parthenon Unified Memory Architecture Limited Liability Corporation, does not oppose these Motions. Mot. 2. For the reasons provided below, Apple's Motions are *granted*.

II. DISCUSSION

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), we 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. The representative Order authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission requires a statement of facts showing there is good cause for us to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*, and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear. *See* Paper 3, 2 (citing *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (representative "Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission")).

In these proceedings, lead counsel for Apple, Mr. Andrew S. Ehmke, is a registered practitioner. Mot. 2; Paper 2, 4. Apple asserts that there is good cause for us to recognize Mr. Zolotorev *pro hac vice* in these proceedings. Mot. 2–3. Apple's assertions in this regard are supported by a Declaration of Mr. Zolotorev. Ex. 1025.

² For purposes of expediency, we refer to the papers filed in Case IPR2016-01114. Similar papers were filed in Cases IPR2016-01121 and IPR2016-01135.



Mr. Zolotorev declares that he is a member in good standing of the State Bar of Califorinia, and that he is admitted to practice before at least two district courts. Ex. 1025 ¶ 5. Mr. Zolotorev also declares that he is familiar with the subject matter at issue in these proceedings, particularly because he represents Apple in the related district court case. *Id.* ¶¶ 3, 4. Moreover, the facts alleged in Mr. Zolotorev's Declaration comply with all the requirements set forth in our representative Order authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission. *See* Ex. 1025 ¶¶ 1, 2, 6–11; Mot. 2–3.

On this record, we determine that Mr. Zolotorev has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Apple in these proceedings. Accordingly, Apple has established that there is good cause for the *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Zolotorev in these proceedings.

III. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Apple's Motions for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Mr. Yakov Zolotorev are GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Zolotorev is authorized to represent Apple as back-up counsel in these proceedings only;

FURTHER ORDERED that Apple is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel in these proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Zolotorev shall comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and



FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Zolotorev shall be subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), as well as the Office's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq*.



For PETITIONER:

David W. O'Brien
Andrew S. Ehmke
Michael S. Parsons
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
david.obrien.ipr@haynesboone.com
andy.ehmke.ipr@haynesboone.com
michael.parsons.ipr@haynesboone.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Massod Anjom
Scott Clark
Amir Alavi
Michael McBride
AHMAD, ZAVITSANOS, ANAIPAKOS, ALAVI & MENSING P.C.
manjom@azalaw.com
sclark@azalaw.com
aalavi@azalaw.com
mmcbride@azalaw.com

