

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

SYMANTEC CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

THE TRUSTEES OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY  
IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2015-00370 (Patent 7,487,544 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00371 (Patent 7,979,907 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00372 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)  
Case IPR2015-00374 (Patent 7,913,306 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00375 (Patent 8,074,115 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00377 (Patent 8,601,322 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00378 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)

---

Before HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP, BRYAN F. MOORE, and  
ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION<sup>1</sup>  
Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission  
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

---

<sup>1</sup> We exercise our discretion to issue one identical decision in each case using this caption style. Unless otherwise authorized, the parties are not permitted to use this style.

Case IPR2015-00370 (Patent 7,487,544 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00371 (Patent 7,979,907 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00372 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)  
Case IPR2015-00374 (Patent 7,913,306 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00375 (Patent 8,074,115 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00377 (Patent 8,601,322 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00378 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York (“Patent Owner”) filed an amended motion<sup>2</sup> for *pro hac vice* admission of Jason G. Sheasby in each of the above-listed proceedings.<sup>3</sup> Paper 9 (“Motion” or “Mot.”). Symantec Corporation (“Petitioner”) does not oppose the Motion. Mot. 5. For the following reasons, the Motion is granted.

## II. ANALYSIS

Counsel may be admitted *pro hac vice* upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel is a registered practitioner. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Specifically, if lead counsel is a registered practitioner, back-up counsel 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.” *Id.*

Lead counsel for Patent Owner in these proceedings is Hong Zhong, a registered practitioner. Mot. 3. In support of the Motion, Patent Owner submits the Declaration of Jason G. Sheasby. Ex. 2001. Mr. Sheasby declares that he is a member in good standing of the California State Bar. *Id.* ¶ 5. Mr. Sheasby further declares that he has not been suspended or disbarred from, and has not been denied admission to, practice before any

---

<sup>2</sup> Patent Owner’s original motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Jason S. Sheasby (Paper 8) is denied as moot.

<sup>3</sup> This decision cites to the record of the IPR2015-00370, unless otherwise noted.

Case IPR2015-00370 (Patent 7,487,544 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00371 (Patent 7,979,907 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00372 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)  
Case IPR2015-00374 (Patent 7,913,306 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00375 (Patent 8,074,115 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00377 (Patent 8,601,322 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00378 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)

court or administrative body. *Id.* ¶¶ 5, 6. Mr. Sheasby declares that he is familiar with the subject matter at issue in these proceedings based on his role as lead counsel for Patent Owner in a related district court lawsuit: *The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York v. Symantec Corp.*, No. 3:13-cv-808 (E.D. VA.). Ex. 2001 ¶ 11. Mr. Sheasby further states that (1) he has read and will comply with the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, and (2) he will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct<sup>4</sup> set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*, and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a). *Id.* ¶¶ 8, 9. Based on the foregoing, we find that good cause exists to admit Mr. Sheasby *pro hac vice* in these proceedings.

### III. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the Motion is granted, and Mr. Sheasby is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel in the above-listed proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that a registered practitioner will continue to represent Patent Owner as lead counsel in the above-listed proceedings; and

---

<sup>4</sup> Although Mr. Sheasby refers to the “USPTO Code of Professional Responsibility,” Mr. Sheasby states that he will be subject to 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*, which sets forth the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct.

Case IPR2015-00370 (Patent 7,487,544 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00371 (Patent 7,979,907 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00372 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)  
Case IPR2015-00374 (Patent 7,913,306 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00375 (Patent 8,074,115 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00377 (Patent 8,601,322 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00378 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Sheasby is to comply with the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, and is subject to the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*, and to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

Case IPR2015-00370 (Patent 7,487,544 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00371 (Patent 7,979,907 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00372 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)  
Case IPR2015-00374 (Patent 7,913,306 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00375 (Patent 8,074,115 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00377 (Patent 8,601,322 B2)  
Case IPR2015-00378 (Patent 7,448,084 B1)

PETITIONER:

David D. Schumann  
Brian M. Hoffman  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
[dschumann-ptab@fenwick.com](mailto:dschumann-ptab@fenwick.com)  
[bhoffman-ptab@fenwick.com](mailto:bhoffman-ptab@fenwick.com)

PATENT OWNER:

Hong Zhong  
Jason G. Sheasby  
IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
[hzhong@irell.com](mailto:hzhong@irell.com)  
[jsheasby@irell.com](mailto:jsheasby@irell.com)