

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

UNDER ARMOUR, INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

ADIDAS AG,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-01528 (Patent 8,721,502 B2)  
Case IPR2015-01532 (Patent 8,652,009 B2)

---

Before JENNIFER S. BISK, MICHAEL J. FITZPATRICK, and JUSTIN BUSCH,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

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 IPR2015-01528 (Patent 8,721,502 B2)

Case IPR2015-01532 (Patent 8,652,009 B2)

Petitioner filed motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Zachary C. Garthe and Robert T. Vlasis in each of these proceedings. Papers 15, 16.<sup>1</sup> Petitioner also filed a declaration in support of each motion. Papers 15, 4; 16, 4. Petitioner states that the motions are unopposed. Paper 15, 3; 16, 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 motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Zachary C. Garthe and Robert T. Vlasis is *granted*, and they 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 this proceeding;

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Petitioner filed substantially identical motions in both cases. All references will be to papers in IPR2015-01528.

Case IPR2015-01528 (Patent 8,721,502 B2)

Case IPR2015-01532 (Patent 8,652,009 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](mailto:brian.ferguson@weil.com)

Anish Desai

[anish.desai@weil.com](mailto:anish.desai@weil.com)

PATENT OWNER:

Mitchell Stockwell

[mstockwell@kilpatricktownsend.com](mailto:mstockwell@kilpatricktownsend.com)

Wab Kadaba

[wkadaba@kilpatricktownsend.com](mailto:wkadaba@kilpatricktownsend.com)

Jonathan Olinger

[jolinger@kilpatricktownsend.com](mailto:jolinger@kilpatricktownsend.com)