

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,  
Petitioner,

v.

ROVI GUIDES, INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Cases IPR2017-00950 (Patent 8,006,263 B2)  
IPR2017-00951 (Patent 8,006,263 B2)  
IPR2017-00952 (Patent 8,006,263 B2)  
IPR2017-01048 (Patent 8,578,413 B2)  
IPR2017-01049 (Patent 8,578,413 B2)  
IPR2017-01050 (Patent 8,578,413 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Patent Owner's Motions for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of  
Mr. David Chun  
*37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)*

---

<sup>1</sup> This Decision addresses an issue that is identical in all six cases. We, therefore, exercise our discretion to issue one Decision to be filed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this style heading in any subsequent papers.

IPR2017-00950(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01048 (Patent 8,578,413 B2); IPR2017-00951(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01049 (Patent 8,578,413 B2); IPR2017-00952(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01050 (Patent 8,578,413 B2)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner, Rovi Guides, Inc. (“Rovi”), filed a Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Mr. David Chun in each of the proceedings identified above. Paper 22 (“Mot.”).<sup>2</sup> Petitioner, Comcast Cable Communications, LLC, does not oppose these Motions. Mot. 3. For the reasons provided below, Rovi’s Motions are *granted*.

## II. DISCUSSION

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), we may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner. The representative Order authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission requires a statement of facts showing there is good cause for us to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*, and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear. *See* Paper 3, 2 (citing *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (representative “Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission”)).

In these proceedings, lead counsel for Rovi, Mr. Mark D. Rowland, is a registered practitioner. Paper 4, 4. Rovi asserts that there is good cause for us to recognize Mr. Chun *pro hac vice* in these proceedings. Mot. 2–3. Rovi’s assertions in this regard are supported by a Declaration of Mr. Chun. Ex. 2013.

---

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of expediency, we refer to the papers filed in Case IPR2017-00950. Similar papers were filed in Cases IPR2017-00951, IPR2017-00952, IPR2017-01048, IPR2017-01049, and IPR2017-01050.

IPR2017-00950(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01048 (Patent 8,578,413 B2); IPR2017-00951(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01049 (Patent 8,578,413 B2); IPR2017-00952(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01050 (Patent 8,578,413 B2)

Mr. Chun declares that he is a member in good standing of the State Bars of California and New York. Ex. 2013 ¶ 2. Mr. Chun also declares that he is familiar with the subject matter at issue in these proceedings, and Rovi has requested that he represent it in these proceedings. *Id.* ¶ 10. Moreover, the facts alleged in Mr. Chun’s Declaration comply with all the requirements set forth in our representative Order authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission. See Ex. 2013 ¶¶ 1, 2–9; Mot. 2–3.

On this record, we determine that Mr. Chun has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Rovi in these proceedings. Accordingly, Rovi has established that there is good cause for the *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Chun in these proceedings.

### III. ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Rovi’s Motions for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Mr. David Chun are GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Chun is authorized to represent Rovi as back-up counsel in these proceedings only;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Chun shall comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and

IPR2017-00950(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01048 (Patent 8,578,413 B2);  
IPR2017-00951(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01049 (Patent 8,578,413 B2);  
IPR2017-00952(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01050 (Patent 8,578,413 B2)

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Chun shall be subject to the Office's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), as well as the Office's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*

IPR2017-00950(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01048 (Patent 8,578,413 B2);  
IPR2017-00951(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01049 (Patent 8,578,413 B2);  
IPR2017-00952(Patent 8,006,263 B2); IPR2017-01050 (Patent 8,578,413 B2)

For PETITIONER:

Frederic M. Meeker

Bradley C. Wright

Scott M. Kelly

Azuka C. Dike

Joshua Davenport

Jared Radkiewicz

Camille Sauer

BANNER AND WITCOFF, LTD.

[fmeeker@bannerwitcoff.com](mailto:fmeeker@bannerwitcoff.com)

[bwright@bannerwitcoff.com](mailto:bwright@bannerwitcoff.com)

[skelly@bannerwitcoff.com](mailto:skelly@bannerwitcoff.com)

[adike@bannerwitcoff.com](mailto:adike@bannerwitcoff.com)

[jdavenport@bannerwitcoff.com](mailto:jdavenport@bannerwitcoff.com)

[jradkiewicz@bannerwitcoff.com](mailto:jradkiewicz@bannerwitcoff.com)

[csauer@bannerwitcoff.com](mailto:csauer@bannerwitcoff.com)

For PATENT OWNER:

Mark D. Rowland

Gabrielle E. Higgins

Scott A. McKeown

James R. Batchelder

Scott S. Taylor

ROPES & GRAY LLP

[Mark.Rowland@ropesgray.com](mailto:Mark.Rowland@ropesgray.com)

[Gabrielle.Higgins@ropesgray.com](mailto:Gabrielle.Higgins@ropesgray.com)

[Scott.McKeown@ropesgray.com](mailto:Scott.McKeown@ropesgray.com)

[James.Batchelder@ropesgray.com](mailto:James.Batchelder@ropesgray.com)

[Scott.Taylor@ropesgray.com](mailto:Scott.Taylor@ropesgray.com)