

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MEDIATEK INC. and
MEDIATEK USA INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

NIPPON TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2020-01404
Patent 7,280,551 B2

Before GREGG I. ANDERSON, CHARLES J. BOUDREAU, and
NORMAN H. BEAMER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ANDERSON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Granting Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice*
Admission of Nathan R. Speed
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On October 1, 2020, Petitioner filed a motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Nathan R. Speed in the above-identified proceeding (“Motion”). Paper 7. The Motion is supported by a “Declaration of Nathan R. Speed in Support of Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice*.” Exhibit 1054 (“Declaration”). Patent Owner did not oppose the Motion within the requisite time period. For the following reasons, the Motion is *granted*.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), we may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause. In authorizing a motion for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires the moving party to provide a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*, and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in the proceeding. *See Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (representative “Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission”).

Having reviewed the Motion and supporting Declaration, good cause exists for granting admission *pro hac vice* to Mr. Speed.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that the Motion is *granted* and Mr. Speed is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in the above-identified proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that a registered practitioner will continue to represent Petitioner as lead counsel the above-identified proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Speed shall comply with the Office’s America Invents Act (AIA) Trial Practice Guide, as updated by the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (“Consolidated Practice Guide”), *available at* <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>; *see*

also 84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019), and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and

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

PETITIONER:

Richard Giunta
Gregory Nieberg
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
rgiunta-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com
gnieberg-ptab@wolfgreenfield.com

PATENT OWNER:

Steven R. Daniels
Michael D. Saunders
DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
sdaniels@dickinsonwright.com
msaunders@dickinsonwright.com