

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SHENZHEN QIANFENYI INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

WACOM CO. LTD.,

Patent Owner.

Patent No. 10,108,277

Issued: Oct. 23, 2018

Filed: Feb. 18, 2016

Inventors: Yasuo Oda et al.

Title: POINTER, POSITION DETECTION APPARATUS AND POSITION
DETECTION METHOD

Inter Partes Review No. IPR2025-01596

**SHENZHEN QIANFENYI INTELLIGENT TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.'S
MOTION FOR *PRO HAC VICE* ADMISSION OF WILLIAM CRAVENS
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)**

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), Petitioner Shenzhen Qianfenyi Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd., (“Maxeye”), by and through its attorneys, respectfully requests that the Board admit William Cravens *pro hac vice* in this proceeding.

II. GOVERNING LAW, RULES, AND PRECEDENT

Section 42.10(c) states as follows:

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 and to any other conditions as the Board may impose. For example, where the lead counsel is a registered practitioner, a motion to appear *pro hac vice* by counsel who is not a registered practitioner may be granted upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.

Further, the Board requires that a motion for *pro hac vice* admission be filed in accordance with the “NOTICE OF FILING DATE ACCORDED – 37 C.F.R. § 42.10” in *Shenzhen Qianfenyi Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd. v. Wacom Co. Ltd.*, Case No. IPR2025-01533 (“Notice of Filing Date”). The Notice of Filing Date states that the motion must “[c]ontain a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during the proceeding,” and “[b]e accompanied by an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear attesting to the following:”

- i. Membership in good standing of the Bar of at least one State or the District of Columbia;

- ii. No suspensions or disbarments from practice before any court or administrative body;
- iii. No application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body ever denied;
- iv. No sanctions or contempt citations imposed by any court or administrative body;
- v. The 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 part 42 of the C.F.R.;
- vi. The individual will be subject to the USPTO Code of Professional Responsibility set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§10.20 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a);
- vii. All other proceedings before the Office for which the individual has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years;
and
- viii. Familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.¹

¹ The USPTO Code of Professional Responsibility in 37 C.F.R. § 10.20 *et seq.* was replaced by the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct in 37 C.F.R. § 11.101 *et seq.*, effective May 3, 2013.

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Based on the following statement of facts, and supported by the Declaration of William Cravens submitted herewith, Maxeye submits that a showing of good cause has been made and respectfully requests the *pro hac vice* admission of William Cravens in this proceeding:

1. Maxeye's lead counsel, Mark A. Miller is a registered practitioner (Reg. No. 44,944).
2. Mr. Cravens is an associate at the law firm of Dorsey & Whitney, LLP ("Dorsey") and is counsel of record for Petitioner, Shenzhen Qianfenyi Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd. ("Maxeye") in the related district court litigation, *Wacom Co. Ltd. v. Shenzhen Qianfenyi Intelligent Technology Co., Ltd.*, Civil No. 2:24-cv-702-JRG (E.D.T.X.) ("E.D.T.X. Litigation"). Mr. Cravens joined Dorsey as associate in August 2023. (Declaration of William Cravens in Support of Maxeye's Motion for *pro hac vice* Admission of William Cravens under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).)
3. Mr. Cravens is a litigation attorney with specific experience in patent law and patent law litigation. Mr. Cravens has represented clients in numerous patent infringement actions across the country. (*Id.*)

4. Mr. Cravens is a member in good standing of the states of Colorado and Texas. (*Id.*)
5. Mr. Cravens has never been suspended or disbarred from practice before any court or administrative body. (*Id.*)
6. No application filed by Mr. Cravens for admission to practice before any court or administrative body has ever been denied. (*Id.*)
7. No sanctions or contempt citations have been imposed against Mr. Cravens by any court or administrative body. (*Id.*)
8. Mr. Cravens has read and agrees to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of the C.F.R. (*Id.*)
9. Mr. Cravens understands that she will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. §11.19(a). (*Id.*)
10. Mr. Cravens has not applied to appear *pro hac vice* in any proceedings before the United States Patent and Trademark Office in the last three (3) years. (*Id.*)
11. Mr. Cravens has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this, and the other related proceeding noted below. Mr. Cravens has fa-

miliarity with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding and in the related E.D.T.X. Litigation in which U.S. Patent Nos. 9,280,220; 9,977,519; 10,108,277; 10,437,356; 9,690,399; 9,933,866; and 10,768,720 were asserted by the Patent Owner in August 2024. Since that time, he has closely studied the asserted patents, participated in discovery related to the same, and submitted invalidity contentions for the foregoing patents. Mr. Cravens has acquired substantial understanding of the underlying issues at stake in this matter.

12. There would be no need to update the Power of Attorney or Mandatory Notices upon granting of this motion, because Mr. Cravens was listed in those previously-filed documents with the expectation that this motion would be brought.

IV. GOOD CAUSE EXISTS FOR PRO HAC VICE ADMISSION OF WILLIAM CRAVENS

The facts outlined above in the Statement of Facts, and contained in the Declaration of William Cravens, establish that there is good cause to admit Mr. Cravens *pro hac vice* in this proceeding under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10. Maxeye's lead counsel is a registered practitioner. Mr. Cravens has specific experience in litigating patent matters and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this, and the other related proceeding noted in Section III., Paragraph 11, *supra*.

V. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Maxeye respectfully requests that the Board admit William Cravens *pro hac vice* in this proceeding.

Dated: October 31, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark Miller/

Mark Miller

Registration No. 44,944

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Telephone: +1(801) 933-4068

Attorney for Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this date, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served via email to Petitioner by serving the correspondence email addresses of record as follows:

Wayne M. Helge (Reg. No. 56,905)
whelge@bdiplaw.com

James T. Wilson (Reg. No. 41,439)
jwilson@bdiplaw.com

Richard C. Lin (Reg. No. 56,682)
rlin@bdiplaw.com

erobinson@bdiplaw.com

BDIP-Wacom_Maxeye@bdiplaw.com

Dated: October 31, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark Miller/

Mark Miller

Registration No. 44,944

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Telephone: +1(801) 933-4068

Attorney for Petitioner