

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 IPR2017-00443
Patent 6,470,399 B1¹

Before JONI Y. CHANG, JENNIFER S. BISK, and JAMES B. ARPIN,
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

¹ IPR2017-01682 has been joined with IPR2017-00443.

Petitioner filed a Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Mr. Andrew V. Devkar (Paper 18), supported by a Declaration of Mr. Devkar (Paper 19²), 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

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

IPR2017-00443
Patent 6,470,399 B1

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.*

IPR2017-00443
Patent 6,470,399 B1

For PETITIONER:

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

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

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

PATENT OWNER:

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

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