Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 16
Entered: March 27, 2019

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED,
Patent Owner.

Cases[1]
IPR2018-01250
IPR2018-01251
Patent 8,447,132 B1

Before TREVOR M. JEFFERSON, DANIEL J. GALLIGAN, and AARON W. MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GALLIGAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Petitioner's Motions for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)

[1] This Order addresses an issue that is identical in both cases. We, therefore, exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties may not use this style heading unless authorized.

In each of the proceedings identified above, Petitioner filed an unopposed Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Noah C. Graubart, as well as a declaration of Mr. Graubart in support of the Motion. Paper 10[2]; Ex. 1019.[3] Petitioner's Motions are granted. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c); *see also Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Order Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission (PTAB October 15, 2003) (Paper 7) (setting forth requirements for *pro hac vice* admission).[4]

It is

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission are *granted* and that Mr. Graubart is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in Cases IPR2018-01250 and IPR2018-01251;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Graubart 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 that Mr. Graubart is 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*.

---

[2] We refer to the papers and exhibits filed in Case IPR2018-01250. Similar papers were filed in Case IPR2018-01251.

[3] Petitioner filed a new Exhibit 1019 on March 26, 2019, to replace the originally-filed Exhibit 1019. *See* Paper 14. We refer to the later-filed Exhibit 1019, and we will expunge the originally-filed Exhibit 1019 to avoid confusion in the record.

[4] Available at http://www.uspto.gov/patents-application-process/appealing-patent-decisions/decisions-and-opinions/representative-orders.

For PETITIONER:

Walter Karl Renner
Timothy W. Riffe
Thomas A. Rozylowicz
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
axf-ptab@fr.com
riffe@fr.com
tar@fr.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Eagle Robinson
R. Ross Viguet
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP
eagle.robinson@nortonrosefulbright.com
ross.viguet@nortonrosefulbright.com