

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE INC.,
MATCH.COM LLC, and PEOPLE MEDIA, INC.
Petitioner

v.

B.E. TECHNOLOGY, L.L.C.
Patent Owner

Case IPR2014-00038¹
Patent 6,628,314 B1

Before SALLY C. MEDLEY, KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, and
LYNNE E. PETTIGREW, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

MEDLEY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

¹ Case IPR2014-00699 has been joined with this proceeding.

On May 29, 2014, Patent Owner, B.E. Technology, LLC (hereinafter “Patent Owner” or “B.E. Technology”), filed motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Daniel J. Weinberg and Ms. Jessica N. Leal. The motions are unopposed.² For the reasons provided below, B.E. Technology’s motions are *granted*.³

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, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner. In authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires the moving party to provide a statement of facts showing 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. Paper 3, Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition, 2 (incorporating requirements in the “Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission” in IPR2013-00010).

In the above-identified proceeding, lead counsel for B.E. Technology, Mr. Jason Angell, is a registered practitioner. B.E. Technology’s motions indicate that there is good cause for the Board to recognize Mr. Weinberg and Ms. Leal *pro hac vice* during this proceeding, and are supported by the declarations of Mr. Weinberg and Ms. Leal.

In particular, Mr. Weinberg and Ms. Leal each declare that they are

² Petitioner did not file an opposition within one week from the filing of B.E. Technology’s motions.

³ Patent Owner filed similar motions in IPR2014-00699, which as stated above, has been joined with IPR2014-00038. Accordingly, the motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Weinberg and Ms. Leal filed in IPR2014-00699 are *dismissed as moot*.

experienced litigation attorneys and have served as counsel in numerous patent infringement cases in various district courts. Declarations.⁴ Mr. Weinberg and Ms. Leal are also counsel for B.E. Technology in at least co-pending litigation, *B.E. Technology, L.L.C. v. Google Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-02830, which involves U.S. Patent No. 6,628,314.

Further, Mr. Weinberg and Ms. Leal have each reviewed and are familiar with the asserted patent, prior art references, claim construction issues, and invalidity contentions in the co-pending litigation. The motions and declarations comply with the requirements set forth in the Notice.

Upon consideration, Patent Owner has demonstrated that Mr. Weinberg and Ms. Neal possess sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in this proceeding, and the Board recognizes that there is a need for Patent Owner to have related litigation counsel involved. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for Mr. Weinberg's and Ms. Leal's admission. Mr. Weinberg and Ms. Leal will be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* in this proceeding as back-up counsel only. See 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

For the foregoing reasons, it is

ORDERED that Patent Owner's motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Daniel J. Weinberg and Ms. Jessica N. Leal are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Daniel J. Weinberg and Ms. Jessica N. Leal are authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered

⁴ The Declarations should have been filed as exhibits and not as a motion attachment. 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(a).

practitioner represent Patent Owner as lead counsel for this proceeding; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Daniel J. Weinberg and Ms. Jessica N. Leal are 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 to 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.

Case IPR2014-00038
Patent 6,628,314 B1

FOR PETITIONER:

Clinton H. Brannon
Mayer Brown, LLP
cbrannon@mayerbrown.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Jason S. Angell
Freitas Tseng & Kaufman LLP
jangell@ftklaw.com