

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSARA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MOTIVE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00574
Patent 11,875,580 B2

Before JUSTIN T. ARBES, BETH Z. SHAW, and DANIEL J. GALLIGAN,
Administrative Patent Judges.

SHAW, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER

Conditionally Granting Patent Owner's Motions for *Pro Hac Vice*
Admission of Ryan J. Marton and Carolyn Chang
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On August 29, 2025, Patent Owner filed motions requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Ryan J. Marton and Carolyn Chang. Papers 14 and 15 (collectively “Motions”). Patent Owner also submitted Declarations from Ryan J. Marton (Ex. 2005) and Carolyn Chang (Ex. 2006) in support of the Motions (collectively “Declarations”). Petitioner has not opposed the Motions. For the reasons provided below, Patent Owner’s Motions are *conditionally granted*.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)(1), 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 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* Paper 4 at 3–4; 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)(1).

Based on the facts set forth in the Motions and the accompanying Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang each have sufficient qualifications to represent Patent Owner in this proceeding, that Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang have each demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and legal familiarity with the subject matter of this proceeding, and that Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang meet all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Exs. 2005 and 2006.¹ Accordingly, Patent

¹ In the Declarations, Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang identify IPR proceedings before the United States Patent and Trademark Office in which they “have appeared.” Ex. 2005 ¶ 8; Ex. 2006 ¶ 8. In light of their representations that neither has ever been denied an application for admission to practice before an administrative body (Ex. 2005 ¶ 5; Ex. 2006 ¶ 5), we will accept the

Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang. Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang will be permitted to serve as back-up counsel only. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)(1).

We note that Powers of Attorney in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b) have not been submitted for Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang. Therefore, Patent Owner's Motions are *conditionally granted*, to be effective after Patent Owner files the aforementioned Powers of Attorney.

Patent Owner has not filed updated mandatory notices identifying Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang as back-up counsel. Therefore, Patent Owner must file updated mandatory notices identifying Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang 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 Ryan J. Marton and Carolyn Chang 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. Marton and Ms. Chang in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b);

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

Declarations as representing that the identified proceedings are the only instances in which they have applied for *pro hac vice* admission before the Office in the three-year period before the Motions were filed. *Unified Patents*, Paper 7 at 3 (at 2.b.vii). If our understanding is incorrect, however, Patent Owner and Mr. Marton and/or Ms. Chang shall notify us promptly, identifying the proceedings before the Office in which Mr. Marton and/or Ms. Chang filed an application for *pro hac vice* admission during that three-year period.

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

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

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Marton and Ms. Chang 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. Marton and Ms. Chang 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>.

IPR2025-00574
Patent 11,875,580 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Jason Eisenberg
Tyler Dutton
Jean Selep
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX PLLC
jasone-ptab@sternekessler.com
tdutton-ptab@sternekessler.com
jselep-ptab@sternekessler.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Hector Ribera
Chien-Ju Chuang
MARTON, RIBERA, SCHUMANN, CHANG LLP
hector@martonribera.com
cjalice@martonribera.com