

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CITADEL SECURITIES LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

HFT SOLUTIONS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2026-00151 (Patent 11,575,381 B1)
IPR2026-00212 (Patent 10,931,286 B1)

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, *Chief Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Petitioner's Motion for
Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Matthew R. Ford
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

In each of the above-captioned proceedings,¹ Citadel Securities LLC (“Petitioner”) filed an unopposed Motion requesting admission *pro hac vice* of Matthew R. Ford (Paper 7, “Motions”) and a supporting declaration of Matthew R. Ford (Paper 7, Ex. B, “Declarations”).² Petitioner’s Motions are *granted*.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motions are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Matthew R. Ford will be authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel only in the above-captioned proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Matthew R. Ford be familiar with the PTAB Consolidated Trial Practice Guide,³ 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.*⁴

¹ Citations are to papers filed in IPR2026-00151. Similar papers were filed in IPR2026-00212.

² Petitioner filed the Declarations as exhibits to the Motions, rather than as separate exhibits. This oversight is excused; however, Petitioner is reminded that affidavits and declarations must be filed separately as exhibits. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(a) (“Evidence consists of affidavits, transcripts of depositions, documents, and things. All evidence must be filed in the form of an exhibit.”).

³ Patent Trial and Appeal Board, Trial Practice Guide (Dec. 2025), *available at* <https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/trial-practice-guide>.

⁴ The Declarations state that “I understand and agree that I will be subject to the USPTO Code of Professional Responsibility set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101, *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a)”

IPR2026-00151 (Patent 11,575,381 B1)

IPR2026-00212 (Patent 10,931,286 B1)

(Paper 7, Ex. B ¶ 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 3, 4–5 (emphasis added). This oversight is excused.

IPR2026-00151 (Patent 11,575,381 B1)

IPR2026-00212 (Patent 10,931,286 B1)

FOR PETITIONER:

Meg Fasulo

Matthew Ford

BARTLIT BECK LLP

meg.fasulo@bartlitbeck.com

matthew.ford@bartlitbeck.com

hft@bartlitbeck.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Dale Chang

Susan Tull

RUSS, AUGUST & KABAT

dchang@raklaw.com

stull@raklaw.com

rak_hft@raklaw.com