

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GLOBAL TEL*LINK CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

v.

SECURUS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-01362
Patent 9,083,850 B1

Before KEVIN F. TURNER, BARBARA A. BENOIT, and
GEORGIANNA W. BRADEN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BRADEN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Patent Owner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of
Daniel F. Olejko

Patent Owner Securus Technologies, Inc. filed a motion pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c) for Daniel F. Olejko to appear *pro hac vice* on its behalf before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in this proceeding. *See* Paper 23. Patent Owner did not indicate whether its motion was opposed, but after seven (7) days, Petitioner did not file an opposition.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), we 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. A motion for *pro hac vice* admission must contain a statement of facts showing there is good cause for us to recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during the proceeding and be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear. *See Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, slip op. at 3–4 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (setting forth the requirements for *pro hac vice* admission).

In his declaration, Mr. Olejko states he is familiar with the subject matter at issue in this proceeding. Ex. 2008 ¶¶ 8, 9. Specifically, he states: (1) he currently represents Patent Owner in several appeals to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which are all appeals from final written decisions in *inter partes* review proceedings before the Board, and (2) has spent consideration time assisting in developing supporting arguments for Patent Owner's responses in the *inter partes* review proceedings. *Id.* In addition, Mr. Olejko's declaration complies with the other requirements for *pro hac vice* admission. *Id.* at 1–2; *see Unified Patents*, slip op. at 3–4.

Having reviewed Mr. Olejko's declaration, we determine that Mr. Olejko has sufficient qualifications to represent Patent Owner in this

IPR2016-01362
Patent 9,083,850 B1

proceeding. Additionally, we determine Patent Owner has shown good cause for Mr. Olejko's *pro hac vice* admission in this proceeding.

ORDER

ORDERED that Patent Owner's motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Daniel F. Olejko is *granted*, and Mr. Olejko is authorized to represent Patent Owner only as back-up counsel in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Olejko 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 Mr. Olejko is subject to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth at 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101–11.901.

IPR2016-01362
Patent 9,083,850 B1

For PETITIONER:

Lori Gordon
lgordon-ptab@skgf.com

Steven Pappas
spappas@skgf.com

Michael Specht
mspecht-ptab@skgf.com

Michael Ray
mray-ptab@skgf.com

Byron Pickard
bpickard@skgf.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Justin Kimble
jkimble-ipr@bcpc-law.com

Nicholas Kliewer
nkliewer@bcpc-law.com

Terry A. Saad
tsaad@bcpc-law.com