

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ORCKIT CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01239
Patent 10,652,111 B2

Before: KRISTEN L. DROESCH, MATTHEW J. McNEILL, and
BRENT M. DOUGAL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

DOUGAL, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Conditionally Granting Patent Owner's Motions for
Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of George Stamatopoulos and Zachary Ritz
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On May 14, 2025, Patent Owner filed motions requesting admission *pro hac vice* of George Stamatopoulos and Zachary Ritz in the above-identified proceeding. Papers 10 and 11 (collectively “Motions”). Patent Owner also submitted Declarations from Mr. Stamatopoulos (Ex. 2006) and Mr. Ritz (Ex. 2007) in support of the Motions (collectively “Declarations”). Patent Owner states Petitioner does not oppose the Motions. Motions, 1.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)(1), 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 us to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*, and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)(1); *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. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz each have sufficient qualifications to represent Patent Owner in this proceeding, have each demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of this proceeding, and meet all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*.¹ *See* Exs. 2006, 2007 ¶¶ 1–10. Accordingly, Patent

¹ Although Mr. Stamatopoulos lists several previous proceedings for which he applied to appear *pro hac vice*, Mr. Stamatopoulos does not include IPR2024-00065 in which he applied (Paper 6) and was granted admission (Paper 7). Given that this motion was granted, we excuse this mistake on this occasion, but remind Mr. Stamatopoulos that he should include all

Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz.

Upon review of the record before us, we note that a Power of Attorney in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b) has not been submitted for Mr. Stamatopoulos or Mr. Ritz. In view thereof, and for the reasons set forth below, Patent Owner's Motions are *conditionally granted*, and are to be effective after Patent Owner files the aforementioned Powers of Attorney.

Patent Owner has not filed updated mandatory notices identifying Mr. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz as back-up attorneys. Therefore, Patent Owner must file an updated mandatory notice identifying Mr. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* Admission of George Stamatopoulos and Zachary Ritz are *conditionally granted*, provided that within ten (10) business days of the date of this order, Patent Owner must submit Powers of Attorney for Mr. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b);

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner must file an updated mandatory notice identifying Mr. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3);

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

other proceedings before the Office for which he has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years.

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz are authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz be familiar with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide² (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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Stamatopoulos and Mr. Ritz are 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.*

² Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

IPR2024-01239
Patent 10,652,111 B2

PETITIONER:

Eliot Williams
Clarke Stavinoha
Jeremy Taylor
Brianna Potter
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
eliot.williams@bakerbotts.com
clarke.stavinoha@bakerbotts.com
jeremy.taylor@bakerbotts.com
brianna.potter@bakerbotts.com

PATENT OWNER:

James Carmichael
Stephen McBride
Minghui Yang
CARMICHAEL IP, PLLC
jim@carmichaelip.com
stevemcbride@carmichaelip.com
mitch@carmichaelip.com