

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

QSC AUDIO PRODUCTS, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

CREST AUDIO, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2014-00127 (Patent 6,023,153)  
Case IPR2014-00129 (Patent 5,652,542)  
Case IPR2014-00131 (Patent 5,652,544)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before MIRIAM L. QUINN, GLENN J. PERRY, and BRYAN F. MOORE,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

QUINN, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER

Granting Petitioner's Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* – Grant E. Kinsel  
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order addresses scheduling that is identical in the listed cases. We exercise our discretion to issue a single paper to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

Case IPR2014-00127 (Patent 6,023,153)  
Case IPR2014-00129 (Patent 5,652,542)  
Case IPR2014-00131 (Patent 5,652,544)

On December 29, 2014, Petitioner filed a second Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Grant E. Kinsel. Paper 36 (“Motion” or “Mot.”).<sup>2</sup> Petitioner also attached an affidavit of Mr. Kinsel in support of its Motion. *Id.* at 4–6. Patent Owner has not filed an opposition to the Motion.

Based on the statement of good cause set forth in the Motion and the facts averred in the affidavit, we conclude that Mr. Kinsel has sufficient qualifications to represent Petitioner in these proceedings and that there is a need for Petitioner to use Mr. Kinsel as counsel in this proceeding. *See Unified Patents v. Parallel Iron*, Case IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (setting forth the requirements for *pro hac vice* admission) (Paper 7). Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), Mr. Kinsel will be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* in the instant proceedings as back-up counsel *only*.

### *Order*

It is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Grant E. Kinsel in the instant proceedings is granted;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Kinsel is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in the instant proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in the instant proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Kinsel is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Title 37, Part 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations; and

---

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner filed identical Motions and supporting exhibit in each of the captioned proceedings. For brevity, we refer here to the papers in IPR2014-00127.

Case IPR2014-00127 (Patent 6,023,153)

Case IPR2014-00129 (Patent 5,652,542)

Case IPR2014-00131 (Patent 5,652,544)

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Kinsel is subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

Case IPR2014-00127 (Patent 6,023,153)  
Case IPR2014-00129 (Patent 5,652,542)  
Case IPR2014-00131 (Patent 5,652,544)

PETITIONER:

Rodney C. Tullett

Chun M. Ng

Kaustav Das

PERKINS COIE LLP

[RTullett@perkinscoie.com](mailto:RTullett@perkinscoie.com)

[CNg@perkinscoie.com](mailto:CNg@perkinscoie.com)

[KMDas@perkinscoie.com](mailto:KMDas@perkinscoie.com)

PATENT OWNER:

N. Andrew Crain

Robert Gravois

Kenneth Knox

THOMAS | HORSTEMEYER, LLP

[andrew.crain@thomashorstemeyer.com](mailto:andrew.crain@thomashorstemeyer.com)

[robert.gravois@thomashorstemeyer.com](mailto:robert.gravois@thomashorstemeyer.com)

[kenny.knox@thomashorstemeyer.com](mailto:kenny.knox@thomashorstemeyer.com)