Paper 74

Entered: September 6, 2018

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_

## BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORP., CAVIUM, INC., WISTRON COPORATION, and DELL INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

ALACRITECH, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01391<sup>1</sup> (Patent 7,237,036 B2) Case IPR2017-01392 (Patent 7,337,241 B2) Case IPR2017-01406 (Patent 7,673,072 B2)

INTEL CORP., CAVIUM, INC., and DELL INC., Petitioner,

V.

ALACRITECH, INC., Patent Owner.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cavium, Inc., which filed petitions in Cases IPR2017-01707, IPR2017-01718, and IPR2017-01728; Wistron Corporation, which filed petitions in Cases IPR2018-00327, IPR2018-00328, and IPR2018-00329; and Dell Inc., which filed petitions in Cases IPR2018-00371, IPR2018-00372, and IPR2018-00375, have been joined as petitioners in IPR2017-01391, IPR2017-01392, and IPR2017-01406.



> Case IPR2017-01393<sup>2</sup> (Patent 9,055,104 B2) Case IPR2017-01405 (Patent 7,124,205 B2) Case IPR2017-01409 (Patent 8,131,880 B2) Case IPR2017-01410 (Patent 8,131,880 B2)

Before STEPHEN C. SIU, DANIEL N. FISHMAN, and CHARLES J. BOUDREAU, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BOUDREAU, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION<sup>3</sup>
Alacritech, Inc.'s Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Antonio Sistos *37 C.F.R.* § 42.10

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This decision addresses issues that are similar in all identified cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one decision to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading in subsequent papers.



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Cavium, Inc., which filed petitions in Cases IPR2017-01714, IPR2017-01735, IPR2017-01736, and IPR2017-01737; and Dell, Inc., which filed petitions in Cases IPR2018-00336, IPR2018-00338, IPR2018-00339, and IPR2018-00374 have been joined as petitioners in IPR2017-01393, IPR2017-01405, IPR2017-01409, and IPR2017-01410.

Alacritech, Inc. filed a Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Antonio Sistos in each of the captioned proceedings. IPR2017-01391, Paper 70; IPR2017-01392, Paper 70; IPR2017-01393, Paper 59; IPR2017-01405, Paper 74; IPR2017-01406, Paper 72; IPR2017-01409, Paper 68; IPR2017-01410, Paper 66. Alacritech, Inc. also filed a Declaration of Mr. Sistos in support of each such Motion as Exhibit 2700. Alacritech, Inc. represents in each such Motion that Petitioner does not oppose. *See, e.g.*, IPR2017-01391, Paper 70, 3. We have reviewed the submissions and determined that the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.10 have been met and that there is good cause to admit Mr. Sistos *pro hac vice*.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED that Alacritech, Inc.'s Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Antonio Sistos in each of the above-captioned proceedings is granted;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Sistos will be authorized to represent Alacritech, Inc. only as back-up counsel in the instant proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Alacritech, Inc. is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in the instant proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Sistos is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Title 37, Part 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations; and



FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Sistos is subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 et seq. and the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).



#### For PETITIONER:

Garland Stephens
William S. Ansley
Anne M. Cappella
Justin L. Constant
Melissa L. Hotze
Adrian Percer
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
garland.stephens@weil.com
sutton.ansley@weil.com
anne.cappella@weil.com
justin.constant@weil.com
melissa.hotze@weil.com
adrian.percer@weil.com

Christopher TL Douglas Kirk Bradley ALSTON & BIRD LLP christopher.douglas@alston.com kirk.bradley@alston.com

Benjamin E. Weed Erik J. Halverson K&L GATES LLP benjamin.weed.ptab@klgates.com erik.halverson@klgates.com

Patrick McPherson
David Xue
Karineh Khachatourian
DUANE MORRIS LLP
pdmcpherson@duanemorris.com
dtxue@duanemorris.com
karinehk@duanemorris.com



# DOCKET

# 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.

