

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

POSCO CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

ARCELORMITTAL,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00370 (Patent 10,961,602 B2)
IPR2025-00371 (Patent 11,326,227 B2)¹

Before BARRY L. GROSSMAN, BRIAN D. RANGE, and
DEBRA L. DENNETT, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

RANGE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Granting Patent Owner's Motions for Admission *Pro Hac Vice*
of Allen Kathir and Raymond LaMagna
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

¹ These proceedings have not been consolidated. The parties are not authorized to use a combined caption unless an identical paper is being entered into each proceeding, and the paper contains a footnote indicating the same.

IPR2025-00370 (Patent 10,961,602 B2)

IPR2025-00371 (Patent 11,326,227 B2)

On October 2, 2025 and October 8, 2025, Patent Owner filed Motions for admission *pro hac vice* of Mr. Allen Kathir (Paper 17) and Mr. Raymond LaMagna (Paper 20), respectively, in each of the above-identified proceedings (collectively “Motions”).² Patent Owner also filed Declarations of Mr. Kathir (Ex. 2018) and Mr. LaMagna (Ex. 2019) in support of the Motions (collectively “Declarations”).³ For the reasons provided below, Patent Owner’s Motions are *granted*.

Pursuant to 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 its notice authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board 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 this proceeding. *See* Paper 6, 3.

Based on the facts set forth in the Motions and the accompanying Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Kathir and Mr. LaMagna have sufficient legal qualification to represent Patent Owner in the above-identified proceedings, that Mr. Kathir and Mr. LaMagna have demonstrated sufficient familiarity with the subject matter of these proceedings, that Mr. Kathir and Mr. LaMagna meet all other

² For purposes of expediency, we cite to Papers filed in IPR2025-00370. Patent Owner filed similar Motions in IPR2025-00371 (Paper 17; Paper 20).

³ We cite to the exhibits filed in IPR2024-00370. Patent Owner filed similar Declarations in IPR2025-00371 (Ex. 2018; Ex. 2019).

IPR2025-00370 (Patent 10,961,602 B2)

IPR2025-00371 (Patent 11,326,227 B2)

requirements⁴ for admission *pro hac vice*, and that Patent Owner's intent to be represented by counsel with litigation experience is warranted. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Kathir and Mr. LaMagna. Mr. Kathir and Mr. LaMagna will be permitted to serve as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

We note that Patent Owner has filed a Power of Attorney including Mr. Kathir in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b). Paper 5. Patent Owner has also filed Mandatory Notices identifying Mr. Kathir as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3). Paper 4.⁵

We note that Patent Owner has not filed a Power of Attorney including Mr. LaMagna in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b). Also, Patent Owner has not filed Mandatory Notices identifying Mr. Kathir as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Allen Kathir and Mr. Raymond LaMagna are *granted*;

⁴ We note that in his Declarations, Mr. LaMagna does not declare that no application to practice before any court or administrative body has ever been denied. As Mr. LaMagna listed several IPRs which he was admitted to practice *pro hac vice* within the past three years (*see* paragraph 6 of the Declarations), we understand this discrepancy as a harmless error.

⁵ *See also* IPR2025-00371, Paper 4 (Updated Mandatory Notices), Paper 5 (Power of Attorney).

IPR2025-00370 (Patent 10,961,602 B2)

IPR2025-00371 (Patent 11,326,227 B2)

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 within seven (7) business days of the date of this Order, Patent Owner shall file a Power of Attorney including Mr. LaMagna in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b);

FURTHER ORDERED that within seven (7) business days of the date of this Order, Patent Owner shall file an updated Mandatory Notice in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3) listing Mr. LaMagna as back-up counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Kathir and Mr. LaMagna are authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Kathir and Mr. LaMagna are to comply with the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide⁶ (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. Kathir and Mr. LaMagna 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.*

⁶ Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

IPR2025-00370 (Patent 10,961,602 B2)

IPR2025-00371 (Patent 11,326,227 B2)

For Petitioner:

Jeremy Monaldo

Sangki Park

Alexander Berg

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

jjm@fr.com

spark@fr.com

berg@fr.com

For Patent Owner:

Brian Buroker

Benjamin Hershkowitz

Mark Reiter

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

bburoker@gibsondunn.com

bhershkowitz@gibsondunn.com

mreiter@gibsondunn.com