

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA, INC.,
ZTE CORPORATION, AND ZTE (USA), INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01493¹
Patent 8,457,676 B2

Before BRYAN F. MOORE, GREGG I. ANDERSON, and
JOHN A. HUDALLA, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

¹ HTC Corporation, HTC America, Inc., ZTE Corporation, and ZTE (USA), Inc. filed a petition in (now terminated) IPR2017-01081, and have been joined to the instant proceeding.

I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner filed a motion for pro hac vice admission of Jonathan H. Rastegar in this proceeding. Paper 25 (“Motion”). Petitioner has not opposed the Motion. For the following reasons, the Motion is granted.

II. ANALYSIS

Counsel may be admitted pro hac vice upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel is a registered practitioner. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Specifically, if lead counsel is a registered practitioner, back-up counsel 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.” *Id.* For the reasons set forth in the Motion and the accompanying affidavit of Mr. Rastegar (Ex. 2008), we find that good cause exists to admit Mr. Restegar pro hac vice in this proceeding.

III. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the Motion is granted, and Jonathan H. Rastegar is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel in the above-listed proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that a registered practitioner will continue to represent Patent Owner as lead counsel in the above-listed proceeding; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Restegar is to comply with the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, and is subject to the USPTO’s Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R.

IPR2016-01493
Patent 8,457,676 B2

§§ 11.101 et seq., and to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under
37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

PETITIONER:

Steven A. Moore
Brian Nash
Rene Mai
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
steve.moore@pillsburylaw.com
brian.nash@pillsburylaw.com
rene.mai@pillsburylaw.com

PATENT OWNER:

Terry A. Saad
Nicholas C. Klierwer
BRAGALONE CONROY PC
tsaad@bcpc-law.com
nklierwer@bcpc-law.com