Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper # 13
Entered: December 10, 2024

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

BOE TECHNOLOGY GROUP CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

OPTRONIC SCIENCES LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01130 (Patent 7,168,842)
IPR2024-01131 (Patent 7,226,801)
IPR2024-01132 (Patent 7,586,121)
IPR2024-01133 (Patent 9,263,509)
IPR2024-01134 (Patent 9,406,733)
IPR2024-01315 (Patent 8,158,477)[1]

Before THU A. DANG, BENJAMIN D. M. WOOD, BRIAN J. McNAMARA, and ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.[2]

WOOD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Patent Owner's Motions for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Christian W. Conkle
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

---

[1] We exercise our discretion to issue one Order that applies to each of the listed cases. The parties are not authorized to use this type of caption.

[2] This is not an expanded panel of the Board. It is a list of all the Judges on the panels for these cases.

Patent Owner filed Motions requesting admission *pro hac vice* of Christian W. Conkle in each of these proceedings. Paper 10 (the "Motion" or "Mot.").[3] Patent Owner submitted Declarations from Mr. Conkle in support of the Motions. Ex. 2007. Patent Owner attests that Petitioner does not oppose the Motions. Motion 2. For the reasons provided below, Patent Owner's Motions are *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, 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 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*, Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (setting forth the requirements for admission *pro hac vice*).

Based on the facts set forth in the Motions and the accompanying Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Conkle has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in each of these proceedings, that Mr. Conkle has demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of each of these proceedings, and that Mr. Conkle

[3] We cite to Papers and Exhibits in IPR2024-01130. Similar items were filed in IPR2024-01131, IPR2024-01132, IPR2024-01133, IPR2024-01134, and IPR2024-01315.

meets all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Motion 1–2, Ex. 2007 ¶¶ 1–10. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for admission *pro hac vice* of Mr. Conkle. Mr. Conkle will be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

We note that Patent Owner filed Powers of Attorney including Mr. Conkle in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b). Paper 4. Patent Owner has also filed Mandatory Notices, identifying Mr. Conkle as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3). Paper 3.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions (Paper 10) for admission *pro hac vice* of Christian W. Conkle in each of the above-identified proceedings are *granted;*

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Conkle is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in these proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Conkle shall be familiar with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board 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

IPR2024-01130 (Patent 7,168,842)
IPR2024-01131 (Patent 7,226,801)
IPR2024-01132 (Patent 7,586,121)
IPR2024-01133 (Patent 9,263,509)
IPR2024-01134 (Patent 9,406,733)
IPR2024-01315 (Patent 8,158,477)

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Conkle shall be 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*.

IPR2024-01130 (Patent 7,168,842)
IPR2024-01131 (Patent 7,226,801)
IPR2024-01132 (Patent 7,586,121)
IPR2024-01133 (Patent 9,263,509)
IPR2024-01134 (Patent 9,406,733)
IPR2024-01315 (Patent 8,158,477)

FOR PETITIONER:

Brian Erickson
Michael Saulnier
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
brian.erickson@us.dlapiper.com
michael.saulnier@us.dlapiper.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Qi (Peter) Tong
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT
ptong@raklaw.com