

**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 Ericsson Inc.’s (“Ericsson”) Unopposed Motion for Leave to Intervene (the “Motion”). (Dkt. No. 46.) In the Motion, Ericsson 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 1-2.) Ericsson further represents that this Motion is unopposed. (*Id.* at 1.) Ericsson filed with the Motion Ericsson’s Answer in Intervention (Dkt. Nos. 47, 48, 49) 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 Ericsson 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