

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., ZTE (USA) INC.,  
OLYMPUS CORPORATION, and OLYMPUS AMERICA INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

PAPST LICENSING GMBH & CO. KG,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00415  
Patent 6,895,449 B2<sup>1</sup>

---

Before JONI Y. CHANG, JENNIFER S. BISK, and MIRIAM L. QUINN,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

CHANG, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION

Granting Petitioner's Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of  
Andrew V. Devkar  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.10*

---

<sup>1</sup> IPR2017-01617 has been joined with IPR2017-00415.

Petitioner filed a Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Mr. Andrew V. Devkar (Paper 19), supported by a Declaration of Mr. Devkar (Paper 20<sup>2</sup>), in the instant proceedings. The Motion is unopposed.

Pursuant to 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. In authorizing motions for *pro hac vice*, we require the moving party to provide 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 in the proceedings.

Upon review of Petitioner's Motion and supporting evidence, we determine that Petitioner has demonstrated that Mr. Devkar has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Petitioner in these proceedings. We also recognize that there is a need for Petitioner to have Mr. Devkar be involved in the proceedings at issue. Accordingly, Petitioner has established that there is good cause for admitting Mr. Devkar.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Mr. Devkar are *granted*; Mr. Devkar is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for these proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Devkar is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as

---

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Devkar's Declaration should have been filed as a separate exhibit and labeled correctly in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.63.

IPR2017-00415  
Patent 6,895,449 B2

set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and he is to be subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R.

§§ 11.101 *et. seq.*

IPR2017-00415  
Patent 6,895,449 B2

For PETITIONER:

Dion Bregman  
Andrew Devkar  
dion.bregman@morganlewis.com  
andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Herbert Finn  
Jonathan Giroux  
finnh@gtlaw.com  
girouxj@gtlaw.com  
GREENBERG TRAUIG LLP

Scott Miller  
Darren Franklin  
smiller@sheppardmullin.com  
dfranklin@sheppardmullin.com  
SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP

For PATENT OWNER:

Gregory s. Donahue  
Minghui Yang  
gdonahue@dpelaw.com  
myang@dpelaw.com  
docketing@dpelaw.com  
DiNOVO PRICE ELLWANGER & HARDY LLP

Anthony Meola  
Jason. A. Murphy  
Victor J. Baranowshi  
Arlen L. Olsen  
ameola@iplawusa.com  
jmurphy@iplawsa.com  
vbaranowski@iplawusa.com  
aolsen@iplawusa.com  
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS, LLP