

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNDER ARMOUR, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ADIDAS AG,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00697 (Patent 7,905,815 B2)
Case IPR2015-00698 (Patent 8,092,345 B2)
Case IPR2015-00700 (Patent 8,579,767 B2)

Before JENNIFER S. BISK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of
Zachary C. Garthe and Robert T. Vlasits
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

Case IPR2015-00697 (Patent 7,905,815 B2)

Case IPR2015-00698 (Patent 8,092,345 B2)

Case IPR2015-00700 (Patent 8,579,767 B2)

Petitioner filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Zachary C. Garthe and Robert T. Vlasis in each of these proceedings. Papers 25, 26.¹ Petitioner also filed declarations in support. Paper 25, 4–6; Paper 26, 4–6. Petitioner states that the motions are unopposed. Paper 25, 3; Paper 26, 3.

Having reviewed the motions and the accompanying declarations, we conclude that Mr. Garthe and Mr. Vlasis have sufficient qualifications to represent Petitioner in these proceedings and that Petitioner has shown good cause for *pro hac vice* admission. Both Mr. Garthe and Mr. Vlasis will be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* in this proceeding as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

It is

ORDERED that Petitioner's motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Zachary C. Garthe and Robert T. Vlasis are *granted*, and Zachary C. Garthe and Robert T. Vlasis are authorized to represent Petitioner only as back-up counsel in these proceedings;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Zachary C. Garthe and Robert T. Vlasis are 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

FURTHER ORDERED that Zachary C. Garthe and Robert T. Vlasis are subject to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and

¹ Petitioner filed substantially identical motions in all three cases. All references will be to papers and exhibits in IPR2015-00697.

Case IPR2015-00697 (Patent 7,905,815 B2)

Case IPR2015-00698 (Patent 8,092,345 B2)

Case IPR2015-00700 (Patent 8,579,767 B2)

the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth at 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101–11.901.

PETITIONER:

Brian Ferguson

brian.ferguson@weil.com

Anish Desai

anish.desai@weil.com

Patent Owner:

Mitchell Stockwell

mstockwell@kilpatricktownsend.com

Wab Kadaba

wkadaba@kilpatricktownsend.com

Jonathan Olinger

jolinger@kilpatricktownsend.com