

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

FACEBOOK, INC.  
Petitioner,

v.

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

---

Case IPR2014-00052 (Patent 6,628,314)  
Case IPR2014-00053 (Patent 6,628,314)<sup>1</sup>

---

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

DESHPANDE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> This decision addresses motions for *pro hac vice* admission submitted in each of the two cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one decision to be entered in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading without authorization from the Board.

IPR2014-00052 (Patent 6,628,314)

IPR2014-00053 (Patent 6,628,314)

Petitioner filed motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Mark R. Weinstein in the above-identified cases on November 21, 2013. IPR2014-00052, Paper 8<sup>2</sup>; IPR2014-00053, Paper 8. Patent Owner did not file an opposition to the motions. For the following reasons, the motions are *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, subject to the condition that lead counsel is 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 4, Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition, 2 (incorporating requirements in the “Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission” in IPR2013-00010).<sup>3</sup>

In these proceedings, lead counsel for Petitioner is Ms. Heidi L. Keefe, a registered practitioner. In the motions, Petitioner states that there is good cause for the Board to recognize Mr. Weinstein *pro hac vice* during these proceedings, because Mr. Weinstein is an experienced litigation attorney and has been involved in numerous complex litigations in state and federal courts. Paper 8, 1. In addition, the motion states that Mr. Weinstein is familiar with U.S. Patent No. 6,628,314 and the petitions filed in these proceedings, and is counsel of record in related litigation involving the same patent, B.E. Technology, L.L.C. v. Facebook, Inc., No. 2:12-cv-2769 (WDTN 2012). *Id.* Mr. Weinstein submits affidavits

---

<sup>2</sup> For expediency, IPR2014-00052 is representative and all subsequent citations are to IPR2014-00052 unless otherwise noted.

<sup>3</sup> After the Notice was entered, an expanded panel of the Board updated the requirements for filing a motion for *pro hac vice* admission. *See* IPR2013-00639, Paper 7.

IPR2014-00052 (Patent 6,628,314)

IPR2014-00053 (Patent 6,628,314)

attesting to, and explaining, these facts. *Id.*, Ex. A.<sup>4</sup> The motions and affidavits comply with the requirements set forth in the Notice.

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

We direct Mr. Weinstein's attention to the Office's Final Rule that took effect on May 3, 2013 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. 20179 (Apr. 3, 2013). The Final Rule also removes Part 10 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations. The motion is granted with the understanding that Mr. Weinstein is subject to the Office's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

For the foregoing reasons, it is

ORDERED that Petitioner's motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Mark R. Weinstein for these proceedings are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Weinstein is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent them as lead counsel for these proceedings; and

---

<sup>4</sup> Petitioner is reminded that each exhibit must be uniquely numbered sequentially and must be appropriately labeled. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.63.

IPR2014-00052 (Patent 6,628,314)

IPR2014-00053 (Patent 6,628,314)

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Weinstein 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 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.*

IPR2014-00052 (Patent 6,628,314)

IPR2014-00053 (Patent 6,628,314)

FOR PETITIONER:

Heidi L. Keefe

Mark R. Weinstein

COOLEY, LLP

[hkeefe@cooley.com](mailto:hkeefe@cooley.com)

[mweinstein@cooley.com](mailto:mweinstein@cooley.com)

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Jason S. Angell

Robert E. Freitas

Freitas Tseng & Kaufman LLP

[jangell@ftklaw.com](mailto:jangell@ftklaw.com)

[rfreitas@ftklaw.com](mailto:rfreitas@ftklaw.com)