

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Apple Inc.,
Petitioner

v.

California Institute of Technology
Patent Owner

IPR2017-00210
U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710

**PETITIONER'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR *PRO HAC VICE*
ADMISSION OF MARK D. SELWYN
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R § 42.10(c)**

I. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioner Apple Inc. (“Petitioner”) respectfully requests that the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) enter an order granting the *pro hac vice* admission of Mark D. Selwyn as back-up counsel for Apple in Case IPR2017-00210. Apple has conferred with counsel for Patent Owner, who does not oppose this motion.

II. APPLICABLE RULE

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), the “Board 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 and to any other conditions as the Board may impose.” “[A] motion to appear *pro hac vice* by counsel who is not a registered practitioner may be granted upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.”

The PTAB set forth requirements for filing motions for *pro hac vice* admission in *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (“Order – Authorizing Motion For *Pro Hac Vice* Admission – 37 C.F.R. §42.10”) (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013). A motion seeking *pro hac vice* must be filed no sooner than twenty-one (21) days after service of the petition, “must contain a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during the proceeding [,]” and must be accompanied by a declaration

or affidavit of the individual seeking *pro hac vice* admission.” *Id.* at 2-3. The affidavit or declaration must attest to: (1) membership in good standing of the Bar of at least one State or the District of Columbia; (2) no suspensions or disbarments from any practice before any court or administrative body; (3) no application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body ever denied; (4) no sanctions or contempt citations imposed by any court or administrative body; (5) the individual seeking to appear has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R.; (6) the individual will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a); (7) all other proceedings before the Office for which the individual has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years; and (8) familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.”

III. FACTS SHOWING GOOD CAUSE FOR THE BOARD TO RECOGNIZE COUNSEL *PRO HAC VICE* DURING THE PROCEEDING

On November 15, 2016, Petitioner filed three *inter partes* review petitions in IPR2017-00210, -00211, and -0219 directed to U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710 (“710 patent”). Patent Owner was served on the same day. Petitioner’s lead counsel, Richard Goldenberg, is a registered practitioner (Registration No. 38,095). Mark D. Selwyn, a partner at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, seeks *pro hac vice* admission in this proceeding. Accompanying this motion as Exhibit 1028 is

the Declaration of Mark D. Selwyn in Support of Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* (“Selwyn Decl.”).

Mr. Selwyn is a member of good standing of the State Bar of California, the Bar of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the New York State Bar. *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶ 2 (Ex. 1028). He has never been suspended or disbarred from practice before any court or administrative body, and has never been denied admission to practice before any court or administrative body. *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶¶ 5-6 (Ex. 1028). No court or administrative body has ever imposed sanctions or contempt citations on Mr. Selwyn. *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶ 7 (Ex. 1028).

Mr. Selwyn has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R. *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶ 8 (Ex. 1028). Mr. Selwyn understands that he will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a). *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶ 9 (Ex. 1028).

Mr. Selwyn has not applied to appear *pro hac vice* in any proceeding before the Board within the past three years. *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶ 10 (Ex. 1028).

As his accompanying declaration demonstrates, Mr. Selwyn has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding. Mr. Selwyn is an experienced patent litigator with more than 20 years of experience.

See Selwyn Decl. ¶ 2 (Ex. 1028). Mr. Selwyn has reviewed the '710 patent and its file history, as well as the Petition, Institution Decision, and the exhibits in this proceeding. *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶ 11 (Ex. 1028). Mr. Selwyn has been involved in numerous patent litigations and has litigated matters that concerned PTO rules and regulations. *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶ 4 (Ex. 1028). Furthermore, Mr. Selwyn represents the defendants, including Apple, in *The California Institute of Technology v. Broadcom Ltd., et al.*, Case No. 2:16-cv-3714-GW-AGR_x (“Caltech litigation”), one of the Related Matters identified in Apple’s Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 7,116,710¹. *See* Selwyn Decl. ¶ 12 (Ex. 1028). Through those litigations, Mr. Selwyn developed extensive experience with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding. For example, he was involved in drafting briefing regarding claim construction for the '710 patent in the Caltech litigation.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Board admit Mark D. Selwyn *pro hac vice* in this proceeding.

¹ IPR2017-00210, Paper 5.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.