Paper # 9 Entered: January 12, 2023



Before KARL D. EASTHOM, JULIET MITCHELL DIRBA, and IFTIKHAR AHMED, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

EASTHOM, Administrative Patent Judge.

ORDER

Granting Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Cristina Q. Almendarez 37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On December 22, 2022, Petitioner filed a Motion requesting *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Cristina Q. Almendarez in the above-identified proceeding. Paper 7. Petitioner submitted a Declaration from Ms. Almendarez in support of the Motion. Ex. 1012. Patent Owner does not oppose the Motion.

Upon review of the record before us, we determine that the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.10 have been met and there is good cause to admit Ms. Almendarez *pro hac vice*.

It is therefore,

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Cristina Q. Almendarez is *granted*; Ms. Almendarez is authorized to act only as back-up counsel in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner continues to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Ms. Almendarez complies with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's Consolidated Trial Practice Guide¹ (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 Ms. Almendarez 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. §§ 11.101–11.901.

¹ Available at https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated_

IPR2023-00178 Patent 7,899,438 B2

PETITIONER:

Charanjit Brahma
Manish Mehta
Samuel Ruggio
BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER,
COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP
cbrahma@beneschlaw.com
mmehta@beneschlaw.com
sruggio@beneschlaw.com

Robert L. Hails Timothy D. Casey Baker Hostetler LLP rhails@bakerlaw.com TCasey@bakerlaw.com