

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

|                    |   |                            |
|--------------------|---|----------------------------|
| SMART RF INC.,     | § |                            |
| <i>Plaintiff,</i>  | § |                            |
| v.                 | § | CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00195-JRG |
| AT&T MOBILITY LLC, | § | (Lead Case)                |
| <i>Defendant,</i>  | § |                            |

---

|                          |   |                            |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| SMART RF INC.,           | § |                            |
| <i>Plaintiff,</i>        | § |                            |
| v.                       | § | CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00196-JRG |
| CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A | § | (Member Case)              |
| VERIZON WIRELESS,        | § |                            |
| <i>Defendant,</i>        | § |                            |

---

|                                    |   |                            |
|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| SMART RF INC.,                     | § |                            |
| <i>Plaintiff,</i>                  | § |                            |
| v.                                 | § | CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00197-JRG |
| T-MOBILE USA, INC. <i>et al.</i> , | § | (Member Case)              |
| <i>Defendants,</i>                 | § |                            |

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Movant-Intervenor Nokia of America Corporation’s (“Nokia”) Unopposed Motion for Leave to Intervene (the “Motion”). (Dkt. No. 51.) In the Motion, Nokia requests leave to intervene in the above-captioned case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. (“Rule”) 24(a) or, in the alternative, Rule 24(b). (*Id.* at 2.) Nokia further represents that this Motion is unopposed. (*Id.* at 1.) Nokia filed with the Motion Nokia’s Answer in Intervention (Dkt. Nos. 52, 53, 54) in compliance with Rule 24(c).

Having considered the Motion, and noting its unopposed nature, the Court finds that it should be and hereby is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Nokia is permitted to intervene in the above-captioned case pursuant to Rule 24(a) or, in the alternative, Rule 24(b).

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 8th day of August, 2024.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY GILSTRAP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE