Paper 10 Entered: January 23, 2019

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., Petitioner,

v.

CHRIMAR SYSTEMS, INC., Patent Owner.

Case IPR2018-01511 Patent 8,902,760 B2

\_\_\_\_\_

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, GREGG I. ANDERSON, and ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WEINSCHENK, Administrative Patent Judge.

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



### I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Michael W. De Vries in this proceeding. Paper 6 ("Motion" or "Mot."). Patent Owner did not file an opposition to the Motion. For the following reasons, the Motion is *granted*.

### II. ANALYSIS

Counsel may be admitted *pro hac vice* upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel is a registered practitioner. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Specifically, if lead counsel is a registered practitioner, back-up counsel may be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* "upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding." *Id.* For the reasons set forth in the Motion and the accompanying declaration of Mr. De Vries (Ex. 1047), good cause exists to admit Mr. De Vries *pro hac vice* in this proceeding.

# III. ORDER

It is hereby

ORDERED that the Motion is *granted*, and Mr. Michael W. De Vries is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in the above-listed proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that a registered practitioner will continue to represent Petitioner as lead counsel in the above-listed proceeding; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. De Vries is to comply with the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, and is subject to the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R.



IPR2018-01511 Patent 8,902,760 B2

§§ 11.101 *et seq.*, and to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).



IPR2018-01511 Patent 8,902,760 B2

## PETITIONER:

James E. Marina
Robert Kang
Eugene Goryunov
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
james.marina@kirkland.com
robert.kang@kirkland.com
eugene.goryunov@kirkland.com

### PATENT OWNER:

Frank A. Angileri
Thomas A. Lewry
Marc Lorelli
Christopher C. Smith
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
fangileri@brookskushman.com
tlewry@brookskushman.com
mlorelli@brookskushman.com
csmith@brookskushman.com

