

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

PLAYTIKA LTD. and PLAYTIKA HOLDING CORP.,  
Petitioner,

v.

NEXRF CORP.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2021-00951 (Patent 8,747,229 B2)  
IPR2021-00952 (Patent 8,506,406 B2)  
IPR2021-00953 (Patent 9,646,454 B1)

---

Before LYNNE H. BROWNE, TIMOTHY J. GOODSON, and  
TIMOTHY G. MAJORS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.<sup>1</sup>

BROWNE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Granting Patent Owner's Motions for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of  
Christopher Gosselin  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.10*

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order addresses issues that are identical in each of the above-captioned proceedings. We therefore exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each proceeding. The proceedings have not been consolidated, and the Parties are not authorized to use this style heading in any subsequent papers.

IPR2021-00951 (Patent 8,747,229 B2)  
IPR2021-00952 (Patent 8,506,406 B2)  
IPR2021-00953 (Patent 9,646,454 B1)

NexRF Corp. (“Patent Owner”) filed Motions for admission of Christopher Gosselin *pro hac vice* in each of the above-captioned proceedings. Paper 9 (“Mot.”, “Motion”).<sup>2</sup> Petitioner has not opposed the Motions. The Motions are *granted*.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), we may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause. In authorizing a motion for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires the moving party to provide 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 the proceeding. *See* Paper 3, 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”)) (“Notice”).

Patent Owner states that there is good cause for the Board to recognize Christopher Gosselin *pro hac vice* during these proceedings because he (1) “is an experienced litigator with more than a decade of experience representing clients in patent litigation matters related to software, electrical, mechanical, and electro-mechanical arts”; (2) “is very familiar with the challenged patent, as well as the legal subject matter, technical subject matter, and prior art discussed in the Petition”; (3) “has personally reviewed the prosecution history, the prior art discussed in the Petition, and the declaration and exhibits accompanying the Petition”; and (4) “has been and continues to be actively involved with preparing

---

<sup>2</sup> We cite to Papers and Exhibits in IPR2021-00951. Similar items were filed in IPR2021-00952 and IPR2021-00953.

IPR2021-00951 (Patent 8,747,229 B2)  
IPR2021-00952 (Patent 8,506,406 B2)  
IPR2021-00953 (Patent 9,646,454 B1)

submissions in this matter, with the strategic, factual, and technical aspects of this matter, and in counseling, and coordinating with Patent Owner.”

Mot. 5–6. Patent Owner also states that it “has a substantial need for Mr. Gosselin’s *pro hac vice* admission and his involvement in the continued prosecution of this proceeding” “[i]n view of Mr. Gosselin’s extensive knowledge of the subject matter of this proceeding.” *Id.* at 6.

The Motions are supported by Declarations of Mr. Gosselin (Ex. 2007, “Decl.”) that attest to the statements above and comply with the requirements set forth in the Notice. *See* Decl. ¶¶ 1–10.

Upon consideration, Patent Owner has demonstrated that Mr. Gosselin has sufficient legal and technical qualifications and familiarity with the subject matter at issue, and that there is a need for Patent Owner to have counsel with his experience. *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 1–3; Mot. 5–6. Patent Owner therefore has established good cause for admitting Mr. Gosselin *pro hac vice* in each of the above-captioned proceedings.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s Motions for admission *pro hac vice* of Christopher Gosselin in the above-captioned proceedings are *granted*; Mr. Gosselin is authorized to act as back-up counsel in these proceedings only;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Gosselin shall comply with the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and

IPR2021-00951 (Patent 8,747,229 B2)  
IPR2021-00952 (Patent 8,506,406 B2)  
IPR2021-00953 (Patent 9,646,454 B1)

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Gosselin is 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.

IPR2021-00951 (Patent 8,747,229 B2)  
IPR2021-00952 (Patent 8,506,406 B2)  
IPR2021-00953 (Patent 9,646,454 B1)

FOR PETITIONER:

Cory Bell  
Gerson Panitch  
Forrest Jones  
Christina Ji-Hye Yang  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP  
cory.bell@finnegan.com  
gerson.panitch@finnegan.com  
forrest.jones@finnegan.com  
christina.yang@finnegan.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Eugene LeDonne  
Brian Murphy  
Jonathan Herstoff  
HAUG PARTNERS LLP  
eledonne@haugpartners.com  
bmurphy@haugpartners.com  
jherstoff@flhlaw.com

Adam Yowell  
Alastair Warr  
FISHERBROYLES  
adam.yowell@fisherbroyles.com  
alastair.warr@fisherbroyles.com