

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Petitioner

v.

MPHJ TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENTS, LLC  
Patent Owner

---

Case IPR2013-00309  
Patent 6,771,381 B1

---

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, MICHAEL P. TIERNEY, and KARL D.  
EASTHOM, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MEDLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

Patent Owner filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Steven G. Hill.  
Paper 12. The motion is unopposed. The motion is *granted*.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), the Board may recognize counsel *pro hac*

IPR2013-00309  
Patent 6,771,381 B1

*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. “Notice”; Paper 5.

In its motion, Patent Owner states that there is good cause for the Board to recognize Mr. Hill *pro hac vice* during this proceeding, because Mr. Hill is an experienced litigating attorney. In addition, the motion states that Mr. Hill has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding based on his work as lead counsel in two district court cases of a related patent, the 7,986,426 patent. Paper 12 at 3-4. Mr. Hill made a declaration attesting to, and explaining, these facts. Exhibit 2001. The declaration complies with the requirements set forth in the Notice.

Upon consideration, Patent Owner has demonstrated that Mr. Hill has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in this proceeding. Moreover, the Board recognizes that there is a need for Patent Owner to have Mr. Hill involved in this proceeding. Accordingly, Patent Owner has also established that there is good cause for admitting Mr. Hill.

Attention is directed to the Office’s Final Rule adopting new Rules of Professional Conduct. *See Changes to Representation of Others Before the United States Patent and Trademark Office*; Final Rule, 78 Fed. Reg. 20180 (Apr. 3, 2013). The Final Rule also removes Part 10 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations. The changes set forth in that Final Rule including the USPTO’s

IPR2013-00309  
Patent 6,771,381 B1

Rules of Professional Conduct took effect on May 3, 2013. Therefore, Mr. Hill is subject to the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct that took effect May 3, 2013.

It is

ORDERED that Patent Owner's motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Steven G. Hill for this proceeding is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for this proceeding; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Hill 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 Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Hill is 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.*

IPR2013-00309  
Patent 6,771,381 B1

For PETITIONER:

Stuart Meyer  
Jennifer Bush  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
smeyer@fenwick.com  
jbush@fenwick.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Scott Horstemeyer  
N. Andrew Crain  
THOMAS | HORSTEMEYER, LLP  
scott.horstemeyer@thomashorstemeyer.com  
andrew.crain@thomashorstemeyer.com