

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ALARM.COM INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

VIVINT, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01965 (Patent 7,884,713 B1)  
Case IPR2015-01967 (Patent 7,884,713 B1)  
Case IPR2015-01977 (Patent 6,924,727 B2)  
Case IPR2015-01995 (Patent 6,535,123 B2)  
Case IPR2015-01997 (Patent 6,717,513 B1)  
Case IPR2015-02003 (Patent 6,462,654 B1)  
Case IPR2015-02004 (Patent 6,147,601)  
Case IPR2016-00116 (Patent 6,147,601)  
Case IPR2016-00155 (Patent 6,147,601)  
Case IPR2016-00161 (Patent 6,462,654 B1)  
Case IPR2016-00173 (Patent 6,535,123 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, JAMES B. ARPIN, and  
CHARLES J. BOUDREAU, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ARPIN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order addresses issues pertaining to all eleven cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

IPR2015-01965 and IPR2015-01967 (Patent 7,884,713 B1)  
IPR2015-01977 (Patent 6,924,727 B2)  
IPR2015-01997 (Patent 6,717,513 B1)  
IPR2015-01995 and IPR2016-00173 (Patent 6,535,123 B2)  
IPR2015-02003 and IPR2016-00161 (Patent 6,462,654 B1)  
IPR2015-02004, IPR2016-00116, and IPR2016-00155 (Patent 6,147,601)

## ORDER

Granting Petitioner's Motions for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of  
Roger G. Brooks and Teena-Ann V. Sankoorikal  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.10*

Petitioner, Alarm.com Incorporated ("Petitioner"), moves for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Roger G. Brooks and Ms. Teena-Ann V. Sankoorikal. IPR2015-001965, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2015-001967, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2015-01977, Papers 4 and 5; IPR2015-01995, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2015-01997, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2015-02003, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2015-02004, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2016-00116, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2016-00155, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2016-00161, Papers 3 and 4; IPR2016-00173, Papers 3 and 4. Petitioner provides Affidavits from Mr. Brooks and Ms. Sankoorikal in support of its Motions.<sup>2</sup> *Id.* Patent Owner, Vivint, Inc., has not opposed Mr. Brooks's or Ms. Sankoorikal's admission *pro hac vice* in these cases.

Based on the facts set forth in the Motions and the accompanying Affidavits from Mr. Brooks and Ms. Sankoorikal, we conclude that Mr. Brooks and Ms. Sankoorikal have sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Petitioner in these cases. Mr. Brooks and Ms. Sankoorikal have demonstrated the necessary familiarity with the subject

---

<sup>2</sup> The affidavits were included in the papers filed in each case, rather than as separate exhibits. The parties are cautioned that such affidavits should be filed as separate exhibits.

IPR2015-01965 and IPR2015-01967 (Patent 7,884,713 B1)  
IPR2015-01977 (Patent 6,924,727 B2)  
IPR2015-01997 (Patent 6,717,513 B1)  
IPR2015-01995 and IPR2016-00173 (Patent 6,535,123 B2)  
IPR2015-02003 and IPR2016-00161 (Patent 6,462,654 B1)  
IPR2015-02004, IPR2016-00116, and IPR2016-00155 (Patent 6,147,601)

matter of these cases and that there is a need for Petitioner to have counsel with experience as a litigation attorney in patent matters involved in these cases. Accordingly, Petitioner has established good cause for Mr. Brooks's and Ms. Sankoorikal's *pro hac vice* admission. Mr. Brooks and Ms. Sankoorikal are permitted to appear *pro hac vice* in these cases as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Roger G. Brooks and Ms. Teena-Ann V. Sankoorikal are *granted*, and Mr. Brooks and Ms. Sankoorikal are authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in these cases;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner shall continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in each case;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Brooks and Ms. Sankoorikal shall 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

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

IPR2015-01965 and IPR2015-01967 (Patent 7,884,713 B1)  
IPR2015-01977 (Patent 6,924,727 B2)  
IPR2015-01997 (Patent 6,717,513 B1)  
IPR2015-01995 and IPR2016-00173 (Patent 6,535,123 B2)  
IPR2015-02003 and IPR2016-00161 (Patent 6,462,654 B1)  
IPR2015-02004, IPR2016-00116, and IPR2016-00155 (Patent 6,147,601)

PETITIONER:

William H. Mandir  
Brian K. Shelton  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
wmandir@sughrue.com  
bshelton@sughrue.com

Roger G. Brooks  
Teena-Ann V. Sankoorikal  
CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP  
rgbrooks@cravath.com  
tsankoor@cravath.com

PATENT OWNER:

Robert Greene Sterne  
Jason D. Eisenberg  
Michael V. Messinger  
Christian Camarce  
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.  
rsterne@skgf.com  
jasone-PTAB@skgf.com  
mikem-PTAB@skgf.com  
ccamarce-PTAB@skgf.com  
PTAB@skgf.com