

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

ADAPTIVE SPECTRUM AND SIGNAL ALIGNMENT, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2024-01379 (Patent 7,809,996 B2)
IPR2025-00012 (Patent 10,848,398 B2)
IPR2025-00013 (Patent 11,770,313 B2)¹

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, KEVIN C. TROCK, and
SCOTT RAEVSKY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

TROCK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Granting Petitioner's Motions for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of
Joseph Drayton, Elizabeth Shrieves, and Edward Wang
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

¹ This Order addresses issues that are identical in each of the above-identified cases. Accordingly, 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 any subsequent papers without prior authorization.

IPR2024-01379 (Patent 7,809,996 B2)
IPR2025-00012 (Patent 10,848,398 B2)
IPR2025-00013 (Patent 11,770,313 B2)

On March 10, 2025, Charter Communications, Inc. (“Petitioner”) filed motions for *pro hac vice* Admission of Joseph Drayton (Paper 7), Elizabeth Shrieves (Paper 8), and Edward Wang (Paper 9) in each of the above-identified proceedings (collectively “the Motions” or “Mot.”).² The Motions in each case are supported by corresponding Declarations of Mr. Drayton (Ex. 1020), Ms. Shrieves (Ex. 1021), and Mr. Wang (Ex. 1022) (collectively “Declarations”). In each Motion, Petitioner indicates that “Petitioner has conferred with Patent Owner, and Patent Owner does not oppose this motion.” Mot. 1.

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 *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. Drayton, Ms. Shrieves, and Mr. Wang have sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Petitioner in these proceedings, have demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of these proceedings, and meet all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Declarations ¶¶ 1–12.

² For expediency, we refer to Paper and Exhibit numbers filed in IPR2024-01379. Similar Papers and Exhibits were filed in IPR2025-00012 and IPR2025-00013.

IPR2024-01379 (Patent 7,809,996 B2)
IPR2025-00012 (Patent 10,848,398 B2)
IPR2025-00013 (Patent 11,770,313 B2)

Accordingly, Petitioner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Drayton, Ms. Shrieves, and Mr. Wang.

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 been submitted for Mr. Drayton, Ms. Shrieves, and Mr. Wang in each of these proceedings. Paper 2, 2. We also note that Petitioner's mandatory notices identify Mr. Drayton, Ms. Shrieves, and Mr. Wang as back-up counsel. Paper 1, 1–2.

It is, therefore,

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Joseph Drayton, Elizabeth Shrieves, and Edward Wang are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Drayton, Ms. Shrieves, and Mr. Wang will be authorized to act only as back-up counsel in the above-identified proceedings;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Drayton, Ms. Shrieves, and Mr. Wang be familiar with the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide³ (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. Drayton, Ms. Shrieves, and Mr. Wang 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.*

³ Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

IPR2024-01379 (Patent 7,809,996 B2)
IPR2025-00012 (Patent 10,848,398 B2)
IPR2025-00013 (Patent 11,770,313 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Erik B. Milch
PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
emilch@proskauer.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

David L. Alberti
Jason A. Fitzsimmons
Richard M. Bemben
Michael D. Specht
Hong S. Lin
Sal Lim
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
dalberti@krameralberti.com
jfitzsimmons-ptab@sternekessler.com
rbemben-ptab@sternekessler.com
mspecht-ptab@sternekessler.com
hlin@feinday.com
slim@feinday.com