

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

APPLE INC.,  
Petitioner,

v.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,  
Patent Owner.

---

Cases IPR2017-00210 and IPR2017-00219 (Patent 7,116,710 B1);  
Case IPR2017-00297<sup>1</sup> (Patent 7,916,781 B2); Cases IPR2017-00700,  
IPR2017-00701, and IPR2017-00728 (Patent 7,421,032 B2)<sup>2</sup>

---

Before KEN B. BARRETT, TREVOR M. JEFFERSON, and  
JOHN A. HUDALLA, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BARRETT, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Granting Petitioner's Motions for *Pro Hac Vice*  
Admission of James M. Dowd and Mark D. Selwyn  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.10*

---

<sup>1</sup> Case IPR2017-00423 has been consolidated with this proceeding.

<sup>2</sup> This Decision will be entered in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this caption style.

IPR2017-00210, IPR2017-00219 (Patent 7,116,710 B1)  
IPR2017-00297 (Patent 7,916,781 B2)  
IPR2017-00700, IPR2017-00701, IPR2017-00728 (Patent 7,421,032 B2)

Petitioner filed in each of the captioned cases an unopposed motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of James M. Dowd. Paper 30<sup>3</sup>. The motion is supported by a declaration of Mr. Dowd. Ex. 1027.

Petitioner also filed in each of the captioned cases an unopposed motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Mark D. Selwyn. Paper 31. The motion is supported by a declaration of Mr. Selwyn. Ex. 1028.

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 Mr. Dowd and Mr. Selwyn *pro hac vice*.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of James M. Dowd is granted;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Mark D. Selwyn is granted;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Dowd and Mr. Selwyn are authorized to act as back-up counsel in the instant proceedings only;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner must file updated mandatory notices identifying Mr. Dowd and Mr. Selwyn as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3);

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for the instant proceedings;

---

<sup>3</sup> We refer to the papers filed in IPR2017-00210. Petitioner filed similar papers in the other cases listed in the caption.

IPR2017-00210, IPR2017-00219 (Patent 7,116,710 B1)  
IPR2017-00297 (Patent 7,916,781 B2)  
IPR2017-00700, IPR2017-00701, IPR2017-00728 (Patent 7,421,032 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Dowd and Mr. Selwyn are to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide 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. Dowd and Mr. Selwyn are to be 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 *et seq.*

PETITIONER:

Richard Goldenberg  
Brian M. Seeve  
Michael H. Smith  
Dominic Massa  
WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE AND DORR, LLP  
richard.goldenberg@wilmerhale.com  
brian.seeve@wilmerhale.com  
michaelh.smith@wilmerhale.com  
dominic.massa@wilmerhale.com

PATENT OWNER:

Michael T. Rosato  
Matthew A. Argenti  
Richard Torczon  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
mrosato@wsgr.com  
margenti@wsgr.com  
rtorczon@wsgr.com