

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

RENESAS ELECTRONICS CORPORATION and
RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

LONE STAR SILICON INNOVATIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01868 (Patent 6,326,231)
Case IPR2017-01869 (Patent 6,388,330)
Case IPR2017-01872 (Patent 6,103,611)
Case IPR2017-01873 (Patent 6,380,588)
Case IPR2017-01989 (Patent 6,153,933)
Case IPR2017-02123 (Patent 6,153,933)
Case IPR2017-02124 (Patent 6,046,089)¹

Before GRACE KARAFFA OBERMANN,
JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, JOHN F. HORVATH,
ELIZABETH M. ROESEL, KEVIN C. TROCK, and
SHEILA F. McSHANE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.²

PER CURIAM.

¹ This Order applies to each of the listed cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be docketed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this caption for any subsequent papers.

² This is not a decision by an expanded panel of the Board. Judges Chagnon, Horvath, and Roesel are paneled in IPR2017-01868 and IPR2017-01869. Judges Obermann, Chagnon, and Roesel are paneled in IPR2017-01872 and IPR2017-01873. Judges Obermann, Trock, and McShane are paneled in IPR2017-01989, IPR2017-02123 and IPR2017-02124.

Case IPR2017-01868 (Patent 6,326,231)
Case IPR2017-01869 (Patent 6,388,330)
Case IPR2017-01872 (Patent 6,103,611)
Case IPR2017-01873 (Patent 6,380,588)
Case IPR2017-01989 (Patent 6,153,933)
Case IPR2017-02123 (Patent 6,153,933)
Case IPR2017-02124 (Patent 6,046,089)

DECISION

Petitioner's Unopposed Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Paul Poirot 37 C.F.R. § 42.10

Petitioner filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Paul Poirot, including a supporting declaration of Mr. Poirot. Paper 8 (“Motion” or “Mot.”) and Exhibit 1019.³ Petitioner represents that Patent Owner does not oppose the Motion. Paper 8, 1. For the following reasons, the Motion is denied without prejudice.

The Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition and Time for Filing Patent Owner Preliminary Response, Paper 4 (“Notice”), advised the parties that, under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), recognition of counsel *pro hac vice* requires a showing of good cause. The Notice authorized the parties to file motions for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c) in accordance with the “Order -- Authorizing Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission” in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (“’639 Order”).

The Motion and supporting declaration do not establish good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Poirot and do not comply with the requirements outlined in the ’639 Order. Neither the Motion, nor the supporting declaration, includes a statement of facts supporting Mr. Poirot’s familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). For example, there is no averment that Mr. Poirot has reviewed

³ Citations are to the record in IPR2017-01868, unless otherwise noted.

Case IPR2017-01868 (Patent 6,326,231)
Case IPR2017-01869 (Patent 6,388,330)
Case IPR2017-01872 (Patent 6,103,611)
Case IPR2017-01873 (Patent 6,380,588)
Case IPR2017-01989 (Patent 6,153,933)
Case IPR2017-02123 (Patent 6,153,933)
Case IPR2017-02124 (Patent 6,046,089)

the Petition, the patent, or its prosecution history or that he is familiar with the technology covered by the patent. Furthermore, the supporting declaration lacks the averment required by the '639 Order, part 2(b), paragraphs v⁴ and viii. Because the Motion and the supporting declaration do not establish good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Poirot and do not comply with the requirements of the '639 Order referenced in the Notice, Petitioner's motion is denied without prejudice.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion is denied without prejudice.

⁴ The Declaration states "I have read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations." Exhibit 1019 ¶ 5. The Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials are set forth in Part 42 of *Title 37*, Code of Federal Regulations.

Case IPR2017-01868 (Patent 6,326,231)
Case IPR2017-01869 (Patent 6,388,330)
Case IPR2017-01872 (Patent 6,103,611)
Case IPR2017-01873 (Patent 6,380,588)
Case IPR2017-01989 (Patent 6,153,933)
Case IPR2017-02123 (Patent 6,153,933)
Case IPR2017-02124 (Patent 6,046,089)

PETITIONER:

Robert Hails
rhails@bakerlaw.com

Michael Riesen
mriesen@bakerlaw.com

Theresa Weisenberger
tweisenberger@bakerlaw.com

PATENT OWNER:

Timothy Maloney
tim@fitcheven.com

Nicholas T. Peters
ntpete@fitcheven.com

David Gosse
dgosse@fitcheven.com