

Trials@uspto.gov  
571.272.7822

Paper No. 14, IPR2016-01750  
Paper No. 14, IPR2016-01751  
Paper No. 14, IPR2016-01753  
Paper No. 14, IPR2016-01754  
Paper No. 14, IPR2016-01755  
Entered: February 1, 2017

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

ROBERT BOSCH TOOL CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

SD3, LLC,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2016-01750 (Patent 7,225,712 B2);  
Case IPR2016-01751 (Patent 7,600,455 B2);  
Case IPR2016-01753 (Patent 7,895,927 B2);  
Case IPR2016-01754 (Patent 8,011,279 B2);  
Case IPR2016-01755 (Patent 8,191,450 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before SCOTT A. DANIELS, NEIL T. POWELL, and  
ROBERT L. KINDER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

KINDER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Decision on Motion for Admission  
*Pro Hac Vice* of Mark A. Hannemann  
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

---

<sup>1</sup> This Order addresses a *pro hac vice* motion filed in five proceedings. We, therefore, exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each of the cases. The parties are not authorized to use this heading style in their papers.

Case IPR2016-01750; Case IPR2016-01751; Case IPR2016-01753;  
Case IPR2016-01754; Case IPR2016-01755

In each of the above captioned proceedings, Petitioner filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mark A. Hannemann. *See, e.g.*, IPR2016-01750, Paper 4. The motion is supported by a declaration of Mr. Hannemann in each proceeding. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1042 of IPR2016-01750. Patent Owner does not oppose any of these motions.

The Board has reviewed the submissions and determined that the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.10 have been met and there is good cause to admit Mr. Hannemann *pro hac vice*.

#### ORDER

It is, therefore,

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Mark A. Hannemann is granted, and Mr. Hannemann is authorized to represent Petitioner only as back-up counsel in each of the proceedings;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Hannemann 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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Hannemann is subject to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth at 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101–11.901.

Case IPR2016-01750; Case IPR2016-01751; Case IPR2016-01753;  
Case IPR2016-01754; Case IPR2016-01755

For PETITIONER:

Patrick Colsher  
SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP  
[patrick.colsher@shearman.com](mailto:patrick.colsher@shearman.com)

For PATENT OWNER:

Jared W. Newton  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP  
[jarednewton@quinnemanuel.com](mailto:jarednewton@quinnemanuel.com)