

DOCKET NO.: 0107131-00564US3

Filed on behalf of Intel Corporation

By: David L. Cavanaugh, Reg. No. 36,476

Richard Goldenberg, Reg. No. 38,895

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP

60 State Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Email: david.cavanaugh@wilmerhale.com

richard.goldenberg@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Intel Corporation
Petitioner

v.

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patent Owner

Case IPR2018-01154
U.S. Patent No. 8,698,558

**DECLARATION OF LOUIS W. TOMPROS IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR ADMISSION *PRO HAC VICE***

I, Louis Tompros, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner at the law firm of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP in Boston, Massachusetts.

2. I have been practicing law for approximately fifteen years. My practice during much of that time has focused on intellectual property litigation, and particularly, patent litigation.

3. I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and am admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, the United States Courts of Appeal for the First, Seventh, Ninth, and Federal Circuits, and the United States District Courts for the District of Massachusetts and the Eastern District of Michigan.

4. My Massachusetts Bar No. is 657791.

5. I have represented parties in patent litigation cases in the District of Massachusetts, the Eastern District of Texas, the District of Delaware, the Northern, Central, Eastern, and Southern Districts of California, the District of Minnesota, and the International Trade Commission, among other jurisdictions. Those cases have involved, among other issues, issues involving Patent Office rules, regulations, and procedures, including inventorship disputes, inequitable conduct,

prosecution history disclaimer, and other issues for which review of a patent's prosecution history is critical. *See, e.g., General Electric Company v. Wilkins*, No. 1:10-cv-00674-LJO-JLT (E.D. Cal.) (involving disputed inventorship); *Qualcomm, Inc. v. Broadcom Corporation*, No. 3:05-cv-1958 (S.D. Cal.) (involving allegations of inequitable conduct).

6. I have represented parties in patent appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in more than thirty cases. Several of those cases were appeals from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“the Board”)—including *In re Thomas G. Packard*, No. 13-1204 (PTAB No. 12/004,324), and *In re Klein*, 647 F.3d 1343, No. 2010-1411 (BPAI No. 10/2007,747). I was lead counsel in the *Klein* and *Packard* cases.

7. I have, on *pro hac vice* admission, represented parties in *inter partes* reexamination matters before the Board in three matters, Reexam Control Nos. 95/000,580, 95/000,633, and 95/001,272.

8. I have, on *pro hac vice* admission, represented parties in *inter partes* review matters before the Board in seven matters, Case Nos. IPR2016-00287, IPR2016-00288, IPR2016-00289, IPR2016-00290, IPR2018-01033, IPR2018-01040, and IPR2018-01040. I have also applied to appear *pro hac vice* in *inter partes* review matters before the Board in eight other matters, Case Nos. IPR2018-01296; IPR2019-00034; IPR2018-01326; IPR2018-

01327; IPR2018-01328; IPR2018-01329; IPR2018-01330; and IPR2018-01340.

9. I have never been suspended, disbarred, sanctioned or cited for contempt by any court or administrative body.

10. I have never had a court deny my application for admission to practice.

11. On November 7, 2013, the Patent Office denied my petition to be admitted *pro hac vice* as backup counsel in *inter partes* reexamination proceeding Control No. 95/001,272. However, upon a petition for reconsideration, the Board subsequently admitted me *pro hac vice* in those proceedings in its decision dated December 12, 2013. In addition, on August 9, 2016, the Patent Office denied my motion to be admitted *pro hac vice* in Case Nos. IPR2016-00287, IPR2016-00288, IPR2016-00289 and IPR2016-00290 for inadvertently omitting averments required by the '639 Order, part 2(b), paragraphs ii and iv. However, upon correction of my declaration in each of those Cases, the Board subsequently admitted me *pro hac vice* in each Case.

12. I have read and will comply with Office Patent Trial Practice guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of 37 C.F.R.

13. I agree to be subject to the United States Patent and Trademark Office 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).

14. I am familiar with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding. I participated in the drafting of the Petition filed in this proceeding, and I have reviewed the papers filed in this proceeding.

15. I am representing and have represented Apple Inc. (“Apple”), which Petitioner Intel has identified as a real party-in-interest, in *Certain Mobile Electronic Devices and Radio Frequency and Processing Components Thereof*, Investigation No. 337-ITC-1065 (the “Apple ITC litigation”, which is a related matter to this proceeding) and 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). In addition, I am representing and have represented Petitioner Intel Corporation in multiple patent-related matters, including the following United States District Court cases: *VLSI Tech. LLC v. Intel Corp.*, No. 5:17-cv-05671 (N.D. Cal.); *VLSI Tech. LLC v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:18-cv-00966 (D. Del.); *DSS Technology Management, Inc. v. Intel Corp.*, Nos. 6:15-cv-00130 and 6:14-cv-00197 (E.D. Tex.); and *Power Management Solutions v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:11-cv-00743 (D. Del.).

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.