

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

INTEL CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

R2 SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00705, Case IPR2017-00706,
Case IPR2017-00707, Case IPR2017-00708,
Case IPR2017-01123, Case IPR2017-01124
Patent 8,233,250 B2¹

Before JAMESON LEE and JENNIFER S. BISK,
Administrative Patent Judges.

BISK, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER

Petitioner's Unopposed Motion for
Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Shirley X. Li Cantin
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

¹ This Order addresses issues that are the same in all identified cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this combined heading in subsequent papers.

IPR2017-00705, IPR2017-00706,
IPR2017-00707, IPR2017-00708,
IPR2017-01123, IPR2017-01124
Patent 8,233,250 B2

Intel Corporation (“Petitioner”) filed a Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Shirley X. Li Cantin. Paper 67 (“Mot.”).² Petitioner provided a Declaration of Ms. Cantin in support of the Motion. Ex. 1056. Petitioner states that R2 Semiconductor, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) has indicated that it does not oppose Petitioner’s Motion. Mot. 1.

Having reviewed the Motion and the Declaration of Ms. Cantin, we conclude that Ms. Cantin has sufficient qualifications to represent Petitioner in these proceedings and that Petitioner has shown good cause for Ms. Cantin’s *pro hac vice* admission.³ See *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Order Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission, Paper 7 (PTAB October 15, 2003) (setting forth requirements for *pro hac vice* admission). Ms. Cantin is permitted to appear *pro hac vice* in these proceedings as back-up counsel only. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

ORDER

It is:

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Shirley X. Li Cantin is *granted*, and Ms. Cantin is authorized to represent Petitioner only as back-up counsel in this proceeding;

² For expediency, we refer to the papers filed in IPR2017-00705. Petitioner filed similar papers in IPR2017-00706, -00707, -00708, -01123, and -01124.

³ In Paragraph 8 of the Declaration, Ms. Cantin refers to “Part 42 of the C.F.R.” Ex. 1056. We assume that she intended to refer to “Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations.”

IPR2017-00705, IPR2017-00706,
IPR2017-00707, IPR2017-00708,
IPR2017-01123, IPR2017-01124
Patent 8,233,250 B2

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Ms. Cantin 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 Ms. Cantin 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 *et seq.*

FOR PETITIONER:

Richard Goldenberg
Donald Steinberg
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE & DORR LLP
richard.goldenberg@wilmerhale.com
don.steinberg@wilmerhale.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

James Glass
John McKee
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com
johnmckee@quinnemanuel.com