

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

WINDY CITY INNOVATIONS LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01067 (Patent 8,407,356 B1)
Case IPR2016-01141 (Patent 8,458,245 B1)
Case IPR2016-01155 (Patent 8,694,657 B1)¹

Before KARL D. EASTHOM and DAVID C. McKONE *Administrative Patent Judges*.

EASTHOM, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice*
Admission of John W. McBride
37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c)

¹ This Decision applies to the three listed cases. The parties are not authorized to use this heading style.

Case IPR2016-01067 (Patent 8,407,356 B1)

Case IPR2016-01141 (Patent 8,458,245 B1)

Case IPR2016-01155 (Patent 8,694,657 B1)

Petitioner moves unopposed for the admission *pro hac vice* of John W. McBride. Paper 7 (“Motion”).² The Board may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

Petitioner’s lead counsel, Joseph A. Micallef, is a registered practitioner. See Motion 3; Paper 2, 1. In support of the Motion, Petitioner submits the McBride Declaration. Ex. 1049 (“Declaration”). Upon consideration of the facts set forth in the Motion and Declaration in each of the captioned proceedings, Petitioner has shown good cause for Mr. McBride to be admitted *pro hac vice* in the proceedings.

It is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion is granted in each of the captioned proceedings, and John W. McBride is authorized to represent Petitioner only as back-up counsel in each of the proceedings;

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

FURTHER ORDERED that John W. McBride 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

FURTHER ORDERED that John W. McBride is to be subject to the Office’s disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the

² For purposes of expediency, the citations refer to the papers filed in Case IPR2016-01155. Patent Owner filed similar papers in Case IPR2016-01067 and Case IPR2016-01141.

Case IPR2016-01067 (Patent 8,407,356 B1)

Case IPR2016-01141 (Patent 8,458,245 B1)

Case IPR2016-01155 (Patent 8,694,657 B1)

USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 et.
seq.

PETITIONER:

Joseph Micallef

jmicallef@sidley.com

Todd Siegel

todd.siegel@klarquist.com

PATENT OWNER:

Peter Lambrianakos

plambrianakos@brownrudnick.com

Vincent Rubino

vrubino@brownrudnick.com