

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

APPLE INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SPEIR TECHNOLOGIES LTD.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00496
Patent 8,345,780 B2

Before BARBARA A. PARVIS, SHEILA F. McSHANE, and
SCOTT RAEVSKY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

ORDER
Granting Patent Owner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice*
Admission of John Petrsoric
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On November 8, 2023, Speir Technologies Ltd. (“Patent Owner”) filed a Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of John Petrsoric. Paper 9 (“Mot.”, “Motion”). The Motion states that “Patent Owner has conferred with Petitioner, and Petitioner has stated that it does not oppose this motion.” Mot. 2. For the reasons provided below, the Motion is *granted*.

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. In authorizing a motion for admission *pro hac vice*, 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* Paper 5, 2 (citing *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (representative “Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission”)) (“Notice”).

In its Motion, Patent Owner states that there is good cause for the Board to recognize John Petrsoric *pro hac vice* during the proceeding because he “has extensive experience representing Patent Owner in patent litigations . . . [and] is intimately familiar with the substantive and technical issues involved in this proceeding.” Mot. 3. The Motion is supported by a Declaration of John Petrsoric (Ex. 2001) that attests to the statements above and complies with the requirements set forth in the Notice. *See* Ex. 2001 ¶¶ 1–10.

Upon consideration of the foregoing, Patent Owner has demonstrated that Mr. Petrsoric has sufficient legal and technical qualifications and familiarity with the subject matter at issue and that it would be beneficial for

Patent Owner to have counsel with his experience. *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 1, 2, 6, 9; Mot. 2–3. Patent Owner therefore has established good cause for admitting Mr. Petrsoric *pro hac vice* in this proceeding. The Motion is *granted*. Mr. Petrsoric is authorized to serve as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

We note that Patent Owner filed a Power of Attorney including Mr. Petrsoric in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b). Paper 11. Patent Owner has also filed a Mandatory Notice identifying Mr. Petrsoric as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3). Paper 10.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s Motion for admission *pro hac vice* of John Petrsoric is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Petrsoric is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in the instant proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Petrsoric shall comply with the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide, 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. Petrsoric 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.

IPR2023-00496
Patent 8,345,780 B2

For PETITIONER:

W. Karl Renner
David Holt
Baile Xie
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
axf-ptab.fr.com
holt2@fr.com
xie@fr.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Brett Cooper
John Petrsoric
BC LAW GROUP, P.C.
bcooper@bc-lawgroup.com
jpetrsoric@bc-lawgroup.com

Robert A. Auchter
AUCHTER PLLC
robert@auchterlaw.com