

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ASSA ABLOY AB, ASSA ABLOY INC.,  
ASSA ABLOY RESIDENTIAL GROUP, INC., AUGUST HOME, INC.,  
HID GLOBAL CORPORATION, and  
ASSA ABLOY GLOBAL SOLUTIONS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

CPC PATENT TECHNOLOGIES PTY LTD.,  
Patent Owner.

---

IPR2022-01045 and IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)  
IPR2022-01093 and IPR2022-01094 (Patent 8,620,039 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before SCOTT A. DANIELS, BARRY L. GROSSMAN,  
FREDERICK C. LANEY, and AMBER L. HAGY,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*<sup>2</sup>

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Granting Patent Owner's Motions for *Pro Hac Vice*  
Admission of Steven M. Coyle and Nicholas A. Geiger  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.10*

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order addresses issues that are the same in each case. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this style heading in subsequent papers.

<sup>2</sup> This is not an expanded panel of the Board. It is a listing of all the Judges on the panels of the above-listed proceedings.

IPR2022-01045 and IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)  
IPR2022-01093 and IPR2022-01094 (Patent 8,620,039 B2)

On October 26, 2022, Patent Owner filed motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Steven M. Coyle (Paper 11) and Nicholas A. Geiger (Paper 12) in each of the above-identified proceedings (collectively, “Motions”).<sup>3</sup> Patent Owner also filed declarations from Mr. Coyle (Ex. 2001) and Mr. Geiger (Ex. 2002) in support of the Motions (collectively, “Declarations”).<sup>4</sup> Petitioner has not opposed the Motions.

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 5, 2 (citing *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (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. Coyle and Mr. Geiger have sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in these proceedings, that Mr. Coyle and Mr. Geiger have demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of these proceedings, and that Mr. Coyle and Mr. Geiger meet all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*, and that Patent Owner’s desire to include

---

<sup>3</sup> We refer to Papers filed in IPR2022-01045. Patent Owner filed similar Motions in each of IPR2022-01089, IPR2022-01093, and IPR2022-01094.

<sup>4</sup> We refer to Exhibits filed in IPR2022-01045. Patent Owner filed similar Declarations in each of IPR2022-01089, IPR2022-01093, and IPR2022-01094.

IPR2022-01045 and IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)  
IPR2022-01093 and IPR2022-01094 (Patent 8,620,039 B2)

counsel from the corresponding district court proceeding is credible.

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

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Steven M. Coyle and Nicholas A. Geiger 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. Coyle and Mr. Geiger are authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Coyle and Mr. Geiger are to comply with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's Consolidated Trial Practice Guide<sup>5</sup> (November 2019), and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Coyle and Mr. Geiger shall be subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct under 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*

---

<sup>5</sup> Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

IPR2022-01045 and IPR2022-01089 (Patent 9,269,208 B2)  
IPR2022-01093 and IPR2022-01094 (Patent 8,620,039 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Dion Bregman  
Andrew Devkar  
James Kritsas  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
dion.bregman@morganlewis.com  
andrew.devkar@morganlewis.com  
james.kritsas@morganlewis.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Andrew Ryan  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
ryan@cantorcolburn.com