Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper 28
Date: December 11, 2023

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MANUFACTURING RESOURCES INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00199 (Patent 8,854,595 B2)
IPR2023-00220 (Patent 9,173,322 B2)
IPR2023-00221 (Patent 11,013,142 B2)
IPR2023-00254 (Patent 10,506,740 B2)
IPR2023-00255 (Patent 9,629,287 B2)[1]

Before JAMESON LEE, JO-ANNE M. KOKOSKI, and
JOHN A. HUDALLA, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

PER CURIAM.

ORDER
Conditionally Granting Petitioner's Motions for
Pro Hac Vice Admission of Srikanth K. Reddy
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 style heading in subsequent papers.

Petitioner filed a motion requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Srikanth K. Reddy in the above-listed proceedings. Paper 23.[2] The motion is supported by a declaration of Mr. Reddy. Ex. 1039. Petitioner states Patent Owner does not oppose the Motions. Paper 23, 2.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), the Board 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. In authorizing a motion for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires the moving party to provide a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in the proceeding. *See Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (representative "Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission").

Having reviewed the submissions, we determine that the Declarations are deficient because they do not fully comport with *Unified Patents*. In particular, Mr. Reddy states "I have never been suspended from practice before any court or administrative body" (Ex. 1039 ¶ 7) instead of "I have never been suspended *or disbarred* from practice before any court or

---

[2] For purposes of expediency, we refer to papers and exhibits filed in IPR2023-00199. Petitioner filed similar motions (Papers 26, 20, 20, 21) and declarations of Mr. Reddy (Exs. 1047, 1029, 1034, 1041) in IPR2023-00220, -00221, -00254, and -00255, respectively. We refer to the motions filed in all proceedings as "Motions" and the declarations filed in all proceedings as "Declarations."

administrative body." *Unified Patents* at 3 (emphasis added). Further, Mr. Reddy states he agrees to be subject to the *Code of Professional Responsibility* (Ex. 1039 ¶ 11) instead of the USPTO *Rules of Professional Conduct* (*Unified Patents* at 3).

Notwithstanding, and based on the facts set forth in the Motions and the accompanying Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Reddy has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Petitioner in each respective proceeding, that Mr. Reddy has demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of each respective proceeding, and that Mr. Reddy meets all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Ex. 1039 ¶¶ 2–4, 6, 10, 11. Accordingly, Petitioner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Reddy. Mr. Reddy will be permitted to serve as back-up counsel only provided that Petitioner corrects the deficiencies in the Declarations as directed below. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

We note that Petitioner filed Powers of Attorney including Mr. Reddy in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b). Paper 1, 2. Petitioner also identified Mr. Reddy as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) as part of its Mandatory Notices. Paper 3 (Petition), 2–3.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Srikanth K. Reddy are *conditionally granted*, provided that within ten (10) business days of the date of this Order, Petitioner submits supplemental

declarations[3] that correct the above-identified deficiencies in the Declarations;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Reddy is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel only in each proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Reddy comply with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's Consolidated Trial Practice Guide[4] (84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019)), 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. Reddy is 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*.

---

[3] New motions and fees should not be submitted.
[4] Available at https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated.

IPR2023-00199 (Patent 8,854,595 B2)
IPR2023-00220 (Patent 9,173,322 B2)
IPR2023-00221 (Patent 11,013,142 B2)
IPR2023-00254 (Patent 10,506,740 B2)
IPR2023-00255 (Patent 9,629,287 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Sanjeet Dutta
Douglas J. Kline
Naomi L. Birbach
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
sdutta@goodwinlaw.com
dkline@goodwinlaw.com
nbirbach@goodwinlaw.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

John C. Alemanni
Carl Sanders
Michael T. Morlock
Courtney Dabbiere
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND
jalemanni@kilpatricktownsend.com
csanders@kilpatricktownsend.com
mmorlock@kilpatrictownsend.com
cdabbiere@kilpatricktownsend.com