

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

CRS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Petitioner

v.

FRONTLINE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Patent Owner

Case CBM2012-00005
Patent 6,675,151

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, and JENNIFER
S. BISK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MEDLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Frontline Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

Frontline Technologies, Inc. (Frontline) filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of R. Scott Tewes. Paper 25. The motion is unopposed. The motion is GRANTED.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), the Board may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause. In authorizing motions for *pro hac vice*, the Board requires the moving party to provide a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in this proceeding. “Order”; Paper 24.

In its motion, Frontline states that there is good cause for the Board to recognize Mr. Tewes *pro hac vice* during this proceeding, since Mr. Tewes is an experienced litigating attorney with an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding. In addition, the motion states that Mr. Tewes is counsel for Frontline in related litigation between Frontline and petitioner. Mr. Tewes made a declaration attesting to, and sufficiently explaining, these facts. Paper 26. The declaration¹ complies with the requirements set forth in the Order.

Upon consideration, Frontline has sufficiently demonstrated that Mr. Tewes has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Frontline in this proceeding. Moreover, the Board recognizes that there is a need for Frontline to have its related litigation counsel involved in this proceeding. Accordingly, Frontline has also established that there is good cause for admitting Mr. Tewes.

It is

ORDERED that the Frontline motion for *pro hac vice* admission of R. Scott Tewes for this proceeding is GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that Frontline is to continue to have a

¹ The declaration should have been submitted as an exhibit. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63.

Case CBM2012-00005
Patent 6,675,151

registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for this proceeding; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Tewes is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of the C.F.R., and to be subject to the Office's 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).

PETITIONER:

E. Robert Yoches
Aaron J. Capron
Darrel C. Karl (pro hac vice)
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
bob.yoches@finnegan.com
aaron.capron@finnegan.com
darrel.karl@finnegan.com

PATENT OWNER:

John P. Donohue, Jr.
John E. McGlynn
Woodcock Washburn LLP
donohue@woodcock.com
mcglynn@woodcock.com