Paper No. 10

Date Entered: March 17, 2014

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_

## BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FACEBOOK, INC.
Petitioner

v.

# EVOLUTIONARY INTELLIGENCE, LLC Patent Owner

\_\_\_\_\_

Case IPR2014-00093 Patent 7,010,536 B1

Before BRIAN J. McNAMARA, Administrative Patent Judge

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE OF MARK R. WEINSTEIN

37 C.F.R. § 42.10



Facebook, Inc. ("Petitioner") moves for the *pro hac vice* admission of attorney Mark R. Weinstein in accordance with 37 CFR 42.10. Paper 8. Evolutionary Intelligence, LLC ("Patent Owner") does not oppose the Motion. We grant the Motion.

#### I. Discussion

As set forth in 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. For example, where the lead counsel is a registered practitioner, a non-registered practitioner may be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* "upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding." 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). In authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board also requires 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. (*See*, Paper 7, "Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission" in IPR2013-00639, entered October 15, 2013).

Mark R. Weinstein provides uncontroverted testimony that he:

- i. is a membership in good standing of the Bar of at least one State or the District of Columbia:
- ii. has not been subject to any suspensions or disbarments from practice before any court or administrative body;
- iii. has never been denied any application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body ever denied;
- iv. has not been subject to sanctions or contempt citations imposed by any court or administrative body;



- v. 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 37 C.F.R.;
- vi. will be subject to the USPTO 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);
- vii. has listed all other proceedings before the Office for which QQQ has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years; and
- viii. has familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.

Lead counsel for Petitioner, Heidi Keefe, who is a registered to practice at the USPTO, has provided a statement of facts that Mr. Weinstein is an experienced litigation attorney, is familiar with the subject matter of this proceeding, and is counsel of record in co-pending litigation between the parties in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Thus, Petitioner has shown good cause why Mr. Weinstein should be recognized *pro hac vice* for purposes of this proceeding. Mr. Weinstein has provided the requisite affidavit or declaration. Therefore, Mark R. Weinstein has complied with the requirements for admission *pro hac vice* in this proceeding.

### II. Order

It is

ORDERED that the Motion seeking admission *pro hac vice* for Mark R. Weinstein is GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mark R. Weinstein may not act as lead counsel in the proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that a registered practitioner must remain as lead counsel throughout the proceeding; and



Case IPR2014-00093 Patent 7,010,536 B1

FURTHER ORDERED that Mark R. 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 the C.F.R.; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mark R. Weinstein is 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.*, which took effect on May 3, 2013.

For PETITIONER:

Heidi Keefe <a href="mailto:hkeefe@cooley.com">hkeefe@cooley.com</a> COOLEY LLP

For PATENT OWNER:

Anthony J. Patek anthony@gutridesafier.com

Seth Safier

<u>seth@gutridesafier.com</u>

GUTRIDE SAFIER LLP

