

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

HTC CORPORATION and HTC AMERICA, INC., ZTE CORPORATION, AND  
ZTE (USA), INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01501<sup>1</sup>  
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

---

<sup>1</sup> ZTE Corporation, and ZTE (USA), Inc. filed a petition in (now terminated) IPR2017-01079, 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 21 (“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. 2007), 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.

IPR2016-01501  
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](mailto:steve.moore@pillsburylaw.com)  
[brian.nash@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:brian.nash@pillsburylaw.com)  
[rene.mai@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:rene.mai@pillsburylaw.com)

PATENT OWNER:

Terry A. Saad  
Nicholas C. Kliewer  
BRAGALONE CONROY PC  
[tsaad@bcpc-law.com](mailto:tsaad@bcpc-law.com)  
[nkliewer@bcpc-law.com](mailto:nkliewer@bcpc-law.com)