

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

DSS TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00782
Patent 6,784,552 B2

Before BRYAN F. MOORE, BRIAN J. McNAMARA, and
MINN CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

CHUNG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Petitioner's Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Jared Bobrow
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (“Petitioner”) filed a Motion requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Jared Bobrow in this proceeding in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10, and provided a Declaration from Mr. Bobrow in support of its request. *See* Paper 8; Ex. 1013. DSS Technology Management, Inc. (“Patent Owner”) does not oppose the Motion. For the reasons provided below, Petitioner’s Motion is *granted*.

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 Unified Patents, Inc . v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639, slip op. at 3–4 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (setting forth the requirements for *pro hac vice* admission).

Jared Bobrow provides uncontroverted testimony that he:

- i. is a member in good standing of the State Bar of California;
- ii. has not been subject to any suspensions or disbarments from practice before any court or administrative body;

- iii. has never had any application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body 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 he has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years; and
- viii. has familiarity with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding.

Lead counsel for Petitioner, Jeremy Jason Lang, who is registered to practice at the USPTO has provided a statement of facts that Jared Bobrow is counsel for Petitioner in the related co-pending litigation and is familiar with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding. Thus, Petitioner has shown good cause why Jared Bobrow should be recognized *pro hac vice* for purposes of this proceeding. Jared Bobrow has provided the requisite affidavit or declaration. Therefore, Jared Bobrow has complied with the requirements for admission *pro hac vice* in this proceeding.

II. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby
ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of
Jared Bobrow is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Jared Bobrow may not act as lead
counsel in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner is to continue to have a
registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Jared Bobrow is to comply with the
Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for
Trials, as set forth in Title 37, Part 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations;
and

FURTHER ORDERED that Jared Bobrow 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.

IPR2016-00782
Patent 6,784,552 B2

PETITIONER:

Jeremy Lang
Jason.lang@weil.com

Robert Magee
Robert.magee@weil.com

PATENT OWNER:

James Gumina
gumina@mbhb.com

Michael Clifford
clifford@mbhb.com