

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

GOOGLE LLC,  
Petitioner

v.

BLACKBERRY LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01619  
Case IPR2017-01620  
(Patent 8,489,868 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY and AARON W. MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> This order addresses an issue that is identical in both cases. We exercise discretion to issue one order to be filed in both cases. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this style heading.

Blackberry Ltd. (“Blackberry”) filed motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Sharon Lee, Paper 13 in both of these cases. The motions are unopposed. The motions are *granted*.

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. In authorizing motions for *pro hac vice*, the Board requires the moving party to provide a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in this proceeding. Paper 5 (“Notice”).

In its motions, Blackberry states that there is good cause for the Board to recognize Sharon Lee *pro hac vice* during this proceeding, because she is an experienced litigating attorney with an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding. Paper 13. Ms. Lee made a declaration, Exhibit 2001, attesting to these facts, which declaration complies with the requirements set forth in the Notice.

Upon consideration, Blackberry has demonstrated that Ms. Lee has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Blackberry in this proceeding and established good cause for admitting Ms. Lee.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Blackberry’s motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Sharon Lee for these proceedings are granted;

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

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

IPR2017-01619; IPR2017-001620  
(Patent 8,489,868 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that Ms. Lee is 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.

IPR2017-01619; IPR2017-001620  
(Patent 8,489,868 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Naveen Modi  
Joseph E. Palys  
Phillip Citroën  
John Holley  
PAUL HASTINGS LLP  
PH-Google-BBIPR@paulhastings.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

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