

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GENBAND US LLC and
GENBAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES CORP.,
Petitioner,

v.

METASWITCH NETWORKS LTD.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-01522
Patent 7,657,018 B2

Before JAMESON LEE, JOSIAH C. COCKS, and
ROBERT L. KINDER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

COCKS, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of A. Ghazaly Imam
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

As authorized in the Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition (Paper 3), Patent Owner (“Metaswitch”) filed a “Patent Owner’s Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of A. Ghazaly Imam Under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10” (Paper 5, “Motion”).¹ Petitioner (“Genband”) did not file an opposition to the Motion. The Motion is *granted*. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c); *see also* IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (setting forth requirements for *pro hac vice* admission).²

It is

ORDERED that the Motion seeking admission *pro hac vice* for A. Ghazaly Imam is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that A. Ghazaly Imam may not act as lead counsel in the proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that a registered practitioner must remain as lead counsel throughout the proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that A. Ghazaly Imam is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of the C.F.R.; and

¹ Paper 5 also includes a “Declaration of A. Ghazaly Imam In Support of Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission.” Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.6(a)(3), combined documents are not permitted. All evidence, including declarations, must be filed separately in the form of an exhibit and properly labelled. For purposes of this Decision, we will not require refiling of the Declaration as an exhibit, however, all future filings must comply with the requirements of § 42.6.

² Available at http://www.uspto.gov/ip/boards/bpai/ptab_trials.jsp, “Representative Orders, Decisions, and Notices,” “Other Representative Orders and Decisions”).

FURTHER ORDERED that A. Ghazaly Imam is to be 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.*

For PETITIONER:

Chad C. Walters
Barton E. Showalter
Brian W. Oaks
Kathryn A. Juffa
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
chad.walters@bakerbotts.com
bart.showalter@bakerbotts.com
brian.oaks@bakerbotts.com
katie.juffa@bakerbotts.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Nicholas Transier
Ankur Garg
Ghazaly Imam
EIP US LLP
ntransier@eip.com
ptab-service@eip.com
gimam@eip.com