

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

BLACKBERRY LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-00911 (Patent 8,745,149 B2)  
Case IPR2017-00912 (Patent 8,745,149 B2)  
Case IPR2017-00913 (Patent 8,402,384 B2)  
Case IPR2017-00914 (Patent 8,713,466 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK, and  
RICHARD H. MARSCHALL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> This Decision pertains to all of these cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue a single Decision to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

IPR2017-00911 (Patent 8,745,149 B2)  
IPR2017-00912 (Patent 8,745,149 B2)  
IPR2017-00913 (Patent 8,402,384 B2)  
IPR2017-00914 (Patent 8,713,466 B2)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Sharon Lee in the above-listed proceedings. Paper 11 (“Motion” or “Mot.”).<sup>2</sup> Petitioner does not oppose the Motion. Mot. 1. 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 Ms. Lee (Ex. 2004), we find that good cause exists to admit Ms. Lee *pro hac vice* in the above-listed proceedings.

## III. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the Motion is *granted*, and Ms. Sharon Lee is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel in the above-listed proceedings;

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

---

<sup>2</sup> We cite to the record in IPR2017-00911.

IPR2017-00911 (Patent 8,745,149 B2)  
IPR2017-00912 (Patent 8,745,149 B2)  
IPR2017-00913 (Patent 8,402,384 B2)  
IPR2017-00914 (Patent 8,713,466 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that Ms. Lee 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. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*, and to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

IPR2017-00911 (Patent 8,745,149 B2)  
IPR2017-00912 (Patent 8,745,149 B2)  
IPR2017-00913 (Patent 8,402,384 B2)  
IPR2017-00914 (Patent 8,713,466 B2)

PETITIONER:

Naveen Modi  
Joseph E. Palys  
Phillip W. Citroën  
John S. Holley  
PAUL HASTINGS LLP  
naveenmodi@paulhastings.com  
josephpalys@paulhastings.com  
phillipcitroen@ paulhastings.com  
johnholley@paulhastings.com

PATENT OWNER:

Ching-Lee Fukuda  
Samuel A. Dillon  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
clfukuda@sidley.com  
samuel.dillon@sidley.com