Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper 35
Date: August 24, 2026

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD. and
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

XIFI NETWORKS R&D, INC.,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-01203 (Patent 11,849,337 B1); IPR2025-01204 (Patent 11,818,591 B2)
IPR2025-01205 (Patent 12,003,976 B1); IPR2025-01206 (Patent 11,950,105 B1)
IPR2025-01207 (Patent 12,015,933 B1); IPR2025-01208 (Patent 11,974,143 B2)
IPR2025-01209 (Patent 11,856,414 B1); IPR2025-01270 (Patent 12,114,177 B2)
PGR2025-00067 (Patent 12,190,198 B1); PGR2025-00068 (Patent 12,169,756 B1)
PGR2025-00069 (Patent 12,250,564 B2)[1]

Before HUNG H. BUI, MICHELLE N. WORMMEESTER, KEVIN C. TROCK, JOHN D. HAMANN, MICHAEL T. CYGAN, and STEPHEN E. BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.[2]

PER CURIAM.

ORDER
Granting Patent Owner's Motions for
Pro Hac Vice Admission of Aaron R. Fahrenkrog
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)

---

[1] This Order addresses issues that are the same in each of the above-listed proceedings. We issue one Order to be filed in each proceeding. The parties are not authorized to use this heading style in any subsequent papers.
[2] This is not an order by an expanded panel. The Administrative Patent Judges listed are paneled in various groups of three in the above-identified proceedings.

XiFi Networks R&D, Inc. ("Patent Owner") filed a Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Aaron R. Fahrenkrog as counsel for Patent Owner in each of the above-identified proceedings. Paper 27 (collectively "Motions").[3] The Motion in each case is supported by a Declaration of Mr. Fahrenkrog. Ex. 2033 (collectively "Declarations").

Having reviewed the Motions and Mr. Fahrenkrog's Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Fahrenkrog meets the requirements for admission *pro hac vice* and that Patent Owner has shown good cause for Mr. Fahrenkrog's *pro hac vice* admission. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c); Paper 4.[4] Patent Owner filed a Power of Attorney including Mr. Fahrenkrog. Paper 28, 1. Patent Owner also filed Mandatory Notices identifying Mr. Fahrenkrog as back-up counsel. Paper 29, 3. Mr. Fahrenkrog will be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* in these proceedings as back-up counsel only.

---

[3] For expediency, we refer to Paper and Exhibit numbers filed in IPR2025-01203. Similar Papers and Exhibits were filed in IPR2025-01204, IPR2025-01205, IPR2025-01206, IPR2025-01207, IPR2025-01208, IPR2025-01209, IPR2025-01270, PGR2025-00067, PGR2025-00068, and PGR2025-00069.

[4] Exhibit 2033 states "I have read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of **Title 37**" (Ex. 2033 ¶ 7), but an individual seeking *pro hac vice* admission must attest that "[t]he individual seeking to appear has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in **37 CFR** part 42." Paper 4, 3–4 (emphasis added). Exhibit 2033 also states "I understand that I will be subject to the Office's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 **C.P.R.** § 11.19(a)" (Ex. 2033 ¶ 8), but an individual seeking *pro hac vice* admission must attest that "[t]he individual will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 CFR 11.101 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 **CFR** 11.19(a)." Paper 4, 3–4 (emphasis added). These oversights are excused.

ORDER

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Motions are *granted* and Aaron R. Fahrenkrog is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel in these proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Fahrenkrog be familiar with the PTAB Consolidated Trial Practice Guide,[5] comply with the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in 37 C.F.R. part 42, and 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*.

[5] Patent Trial and Appeal Board, Consolidated Trial Practice Guide (Dec. 2025), *available at* https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/trial-practice-guide.

For PETITIONER:

James M. Glass
Benjamin Kleinman
Quincy Lu
Patrick T. Schmidt
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
jimglass@quinnemanuel.com
benjaminkleinman@quinnemanuel.com
quincylu@quinnemanuel.com
patrickschmidt@quinnemanuel.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Cyrus A. Morton
Jessica L. Gutierrez
ROBINS KAPLAN LLP
cmorton@robinskaplan.com
jgutierrez@robinskaplan.com
rkxifi@robinskaplan.com