Paper 42

Entered: July 22, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC, ZTE (USA), INC.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
LG ELECTRONICS INC., HUAWEI DEVICE USA, INC.,
HUAWEI DEVICE CO. LTD., HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO. LTD.,
HUAWEI DEVICE (DONGGUAN) CO. LTD.,
HUAWEI INVESTMENT & HOLDING CO. LTD.,
HUAWEI TECH. INVESTMENT CO. LTD., and
HUAWEI DEVICE (HONG KONG) CO. LTD.,
Petitioner.

v.

CYWEE GROUP LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2018-01257 (Patent 8,552,978 B2) IPR2018-01258 (Patent 8,441,438 B2)¹

Before PATRICK M. BOUCHER, KAMRAN JIVANI, and CHRISTOPHER L. OGDEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BOUCHER, Administrative Patent Judge.

ORDER

Granting Patent Owner's Motions for Admission Pro Hac Vice of Michael W. Shore 37 C.F.R. § 42.10

¹ This Order addresses issues that are the same in the above-identified proceedings. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be entered in each proceeding. The Parties are not authorized to use this joint heading and filing style in their papers.



On June 28, 2019, Patent Owner filed motions for admission *pro hac vice* of Michael W. Shore in each of the above-identified proceedings (collectively "Motions"). Paper 33.² Patent Owner also filed declarations of Mr. Shore in support of the Motions (collectively "Declarations"). Ex. 2017.³ Petitioner has not filed an opposition to the Motions. For the reasons provided below, Patent Owner's 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, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner. In its notice authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires 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. *See* Paper 5, 2 (citing *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (representative "Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission")).

Based on the facts set forth in the Motions and the accompanying Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Shore has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in these proceedings, that Mr. Shore has demonstrated sufficient familiarity with the subject matter of these proceedings, and that Patent Owner's intent to be represented by counsel with litigation experience is warranted.

³ We cite to Exhibits filed in IPR2018-01257. Patent Owner filed a similar Declaration in IPR2018-01258 (Ex. 2017).



7

² We cite to Papers filed in IPR2018-01257. Patent Owner filed a similar Motion in IPR2018-01258 (Paper 33).

Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Shore.

We acknowledge that Mr. Shore discloses an instance in which he was instructed by a court not to send opposing counsel emails for a limited period during a past trial. Ex. 2017 ¶ 8. We do not find that the incident described by Mr. Shore warrants a denial of Patent Owner's Motions. Mr. Shore is reminded, however, that he will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et. seq.*

A Power of Attorney has not been submitted for Mr. Shore. Accordingly, Patent Owner must submit a Power of Attorney for Mr. Shore in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b), and must update its Mandatory Notices as required by 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Michael W. Shore are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Shore is authorized to represent Patent Owner only as back-up counsel in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Shore is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, as updated by the August 2018 Update, 83 Federal Register 39,989 (Aug. 13, 2018), and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations;



FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Shore shall be 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.*;⁴

FURTHER ORDERED that, within ten (10) business days of the date of this Order, Patent Owner must submit Powers of Attorney for Mr. Shore in each of the above-identified proceedings in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b); and

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner shall file updated Mandatory Notices in each of the above-identified proceedings in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3), identifying Mr. Shore as back-up counsel.

⁴ In the Declarations, Mr. Shore indicates he will be subject to the *USPTO Code of Professional Responsibility* set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 10.20 et seq., as opposed to the *USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct* set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 et. seq. Ex. 2017 ¶ 10. We deem this harmless error.



1

For Petitioner:

Matthew A. Smith Andrew S. Baluch SMITH BALUCH LLP smith@smithbaluch.com baluch@smithbaluch.com

James Sobieraj
Jon Beaupre
Yeuzhong Feng
Andres Shoffstall
BRINKS GILSON & LIONE
jsobieraj@brinksgilson.com
jbeaupre@brinksgilson.com
yfen@brinksgilson.com
ashoffstall@brinksgilson.com

Naveen Modi Chetan Bansal PAUL HASTINGS LLP naveenmodi@paulhastings.com chetanbansal@paulhastings.com

Collin Park
Andrew Devkar
Jeremy Peterson
Adam Brooke
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Collin.park@morganlewis.com
Andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com
jpeterson@morganlewis.com
adam.brooke@morganlewis.com

Kristopher Reed Benjamin Klein Norris Booth KILPATRICK TOWNSEND



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.

