

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

UNILOC 2017 LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AT&T SERVICES, INC., AT&T MOBILITY
LLC,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:19-CV-00102-JRG

ORDER

Before the Court is Ericsson Inc.’s (“Ericsson”) Unopposed Motion to Intervene as a Defendant (the “Motion”). (Dkt. No. 32.) Ericsson moved to intervene pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2) or, in the alternative, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b). Having considered the Motion, its unopposed nature, and the relevant authorities,¹ the Court finds the Motion should be and hereby is **GRANTED** pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2) or, in the alternative 24(b). Accordingly, Ericsson is permitted to intervene in this action and is **GRANTED LEAVE** to file its Answer in Intervention in **Case No. 2:19-cv-102**, which it shall do within fourteen (14) days of this Order.

¹ See, e.g., *Team Worldwide Corp. v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 2:17-cv-00235-JRG, 2017 WL 6059303 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 7, 2017) (applying relevant authorities where requested intervenors were manufacturers or product suppliers seeking to intervene in a patent infringement suit against a retailer, similar to this case). Here, Ericsson contends that it designs and manufactures the accused products, which are then used by AT&T. (See generally Dkt. No. 32.)

So Ordered this

Sep 16, 2019



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE