

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Intel Corporation
Petitioner

v.

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patent Owner

IPR2018-01153
U.S. Patent No. 8,698,558

**PETITIONER'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR *PRO HAC VICE*
ADMISSION OF JAMES M. DOWD
PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R § 42.10(c)**

I. STATEMENT OF RELIEF REQUESTED

Petitioner Intel Corporation (“Petitioner” or “Intel”) respectfully requests that the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) enter an order granting the *pro hac vice* admission of James M. Dowd as back-up counsel for Intel in Case IPR2018-01153. Intel has conferred with counsel for Patent Owner, who does not oppose this motion.

II. APPLICABLE RULE

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, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner and to any other conditions as the Board may impose.” “[A] motion to appear *pro hac vice* by counsel who is not a registered practitioner may be granted upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.”

The Board set forth requirements for filing motions for *pro hac vice* admission in *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (“Order – Authorizing Motion For *Pro Hac Vice* Admission – 37 C.F.R. §42.10”) (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013). A motion seeking *pro hac vice* must be filed no sooner than twenty-one (21) days after service of the petition, “must contain a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel

pro hac vice during the proceeding [,]” and must be accompanied by a declaration or affidavit of the individual seeking *pro hac vice* admission.” *Id.* at 2-3. The affidavit or declaration must attest to: (1) membership in good standing of the Bar of at least one State or the District of Columbia; (2) no suspensions or disbarments from any practice before any court or administrative body; (3) no application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body ever denied; (4) no sanctions or contempt citations imposed by any court or administrative body; (5) the individual seeking to appear has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R.; (6) the individual will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a); (7) all other proceedings before the Office for which the individual has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years; and (8) familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.”

III. FACTS SHOWING GOOD CAUSE FOR THE BOARD TO RECOGNIZE COUNSEL *PRO HAC VICE* DURING THE PROCEEDING

On June 28, 2018, Petitioner filed four *inter partes* review petitions in IPR2018-01152, -01153, -01154, and -01240 directed to U.S. Patent No. 8,698,558 (“588 patent”). Patent Owner was served on the same day. Petitioner’s lead counsel, David L. Cavanaugh is a registered practitioner (Registration No. 36,476).

James M. Dowd, a partner at Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, seeks *pro hac vice* admission in this proceeding. Accompanying this motion as Exhibit 1124 is the Declaration of James M. Dowd in Support of Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* (“Dowd Decl.”).

Mr. Dowd is a member of good standing of the State Bar of California, the District of Columbia Bar, and the Virginia State Bar. Dowd Decl. ¶ 2 (Ex. 1124). He has never been suspended or disbarred from practice before any court or administrative body, and has never been denied admission to practice before any court or administrative body. Dowd Decl. ¶¶ 5-6 (Ex. 1124). No court or administrative body has ever imposed sanctions or contempt citations on Mr. Dowd. Dowd Decl. ¶ 7 (Ex. 1124).

Mr. Dowd has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R. Dowd Decl. ¶ 8 (Ex. 1124). Mr. Dowd understands that he will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et. seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a). Dowd Decl. ¶ 9 (Ex. 1124).

Within the last three years, Mr. Dowd has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the following proceedings:

- *Apple, Inc. v. California Institute of Technology*, Case IPR2017-00210;
- *Apple, Inc. v. California Institute of Technology*, Case IPR2017-00219;

- *Apple, Inc. v. California Institute of Technology*, Case IPR2017-00297¹;
- *Apple, Inc. v. California Institute of Technology*, Case IPR2017-00700;
- *Apple, Inc. v. California Institute of Technology*, Case IPR2017-00701;
- *Apple, Inc. v. California Institute of Technology*, Case IPR2017-00728.

Dowd Decl. ¶ 10 (Ex. 1124).

As his accompanying declaration demonstrates, Mr. Dowd has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding. Mr. Dowd is an experienced patent litigator with over 21 years of experience. Dowd Decl. ¶ 2 (Ex. 1124). Mr. Dowd has reviewed the '558 patent and its file history, as well as the Petition, Institution Decision, and the exhibits in this proceeding. Dowd Decl. ¶ 11 (Ex. 1124). Mr. Dowd has been involved in numerous patent litigations, has litigated matters that concerned PTO rules and regulations, and has previously appeared *pro hac vice* before the Board. Dowd Decl. ¶ 4 (Ex. 1124). Furthermore, Mr. Dowd represents Apple Inc. ("Apple"), identified by Petitioner Intel as a real party-in-interest in the Apple litigation, in *Qualcomm Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, No. 3:17-cv-1375 (S.D. Cal.) (the "Apple litigation"), which is a related matter to this proceeding. Dowd Decl. ¶ 12 (Ex. 1124). In addition, Mr. Dowd previously litigated the validity of the '558 patent in *Certain Mobile Electronic*

¹ IPR2017-00423 was consolidated with IPR2017-00297.

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.