Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper: 24
Entered: May 15, 2024

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CANON U.S.A., INC. and CANON INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SLINGSHOT PRINTING LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00309 (Patent 7,290,864 B2)
IPR2023-00312 (Patent 7,484,823 B2)
IPR2023-00313 (Patent 7,594,708 B2)[1]

Before JO-ANNE M. KOKOSKI, GARTH D. BAER, and JOHN D. HAMANN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

ORDER
Conditionally Granting Patent Owner's Motion for
Pro Hac Vice Admission of Rayiner I. Hashem
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

[1] This Order addresses issues that are the same in each of the above-identified proceedings. We issue one Order to be entered in each proceeding. The parties are not authorized to use this style caption unless later permitted.

On May 3, 2024, Patent Owner filed a motion requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Rayiner I. Hashem in each of the above-identified proceedings. Paper 18 ("Motion").[2] Patent Owner also submitted a Declaration from Mr. Hashem in support of the Motion in each proceeding. Ex. 2006 ("Declaration"). Patent Owner indicates that Petitioner does not oppose the Motions. For the reasons provided below, Patent Owner's Motions are *conditionally granted*.

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 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (representative "Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission").

Based on the facts set forth in the Motions and the accompanying Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Hashem has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in these proceedings, has demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of the proceedings, and meets all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Paper 18; Ex. 2006. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Hashem.

---

[2] For expediency, we cite to papers in IPR2023-00309. Similar papers were filed in IPR2023-00312 and IPR2023-00313.

Our rules require, however, that "[a] power of attorney must be filed with the designation of counsel." 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b). Patent Owner has not filed Powers of Attorney in the above-identified proceedings identifying Mr. Hashem. Therefore, Mr. Hashem's *pro hac vice* admission will not be effective until Patent Owner files updated Powers of Attorney.

We also remind Patent Owner that our rules require filing updated Mandatory Notices "within 21 days of a change of the information" regarding Patent Owner's representation by counsel. 37 C.F.R. §§ 42.8(a)(c), (b)(3).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Rayiner I. Hashem are *conditionally granted*, effective upon the filing of updated Powers of Attorney identifying Mr. Hashem;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Hashem is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Hashem be familiar with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide[3] (84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019)), and comply with the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and

[3] Available at https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated.

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Hashem 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.*

IPR2023-00309 (Patent 7,290,864 B2)
IPR2023-00312 (Patent 7,484,823 B2)
IPR2023-00313 (Patent 7,594,708 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Dion M. Bregman
Amanda S. Williamson
Jason E. Gettleman
James J. Kritsas
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
dion.bregman@morganlewis.com
amanda.williamson@morganlewis.com
jason.gettleman@morganlewis.com
james.kritsas@morganlewis.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Timothy P. Maloney
Paul B. Henkelmann
Mark A. Borsos
David A. Gosse
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY LLP
tim@fitcheven.com
phenkelmann@fitcheven.com
mborsos@fitcheven.com
dgosse@fitcheven.com