

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MICROSOFT CORPORTION,
Petitioner,

v.

BRADIUM TECHNOLOGIES LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00448¹
Patent 7,908,343 B2
Case IPR2016-00449
Patent 8,924,506 B2
Case IPR2016-01897
Patent 9,253,239 B2

BRIAN J. McNAMARA, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO HAC VICE OF
EVAN S. DAY

37 C.F.R. § 42.10

¹ This Order addresses issues that are identical in related cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue one order to be filed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this style heading in any subsequent papers.

In each of the captioned proceedings, Microsoft Corporation (“Petitioner”) moves for the *pro hac vice* admission of attorney Evan S. Day in accordance with 37 CFR 42.10. Bradium Technologies 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).

Evan S. Day provides uncontroverted testimony that he:

- i. is a membership in good standing of the Bar of at least one State or the Southern District of California;
- 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 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 the proceeding.

Lead counsel for Petitioner, Bing Ai, who is a registered to practice at the USPTO has provided a statement of facts that Mr. Day is counsel for Petitioner in co-pending litigation and is familiar with the subject matter at issue in the captioned proceedings. Thus, Petitioner has shown good cause why Evan S. Day should be recognized *pro hac vice* for purposes of this proceeding. Mr. Day has provided the requisite affidavit or declaration. Therefore, Evan S. Day 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 Evan S. Day in each of the captioned proceedings is GRANTED;

FURTHER ORDERED that Evan S. Day may not act as lead counsel in any of the captioned proceedings;

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

Case IPR2016-00448; IPR2016-00449; IPR2016-01897
Patent 7,098,343 B2; 8,924,506 B2; 9,253,239 B2

FURTHER ORDERED that Evan S. Day 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 Evan S. Day 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.

PETITIONER: (via electronic transmission)

Bing Ai
Vinay Sathe
Patrick J. McKeever
PERKINS COIE LLP
Ai-ptab@perkinscoie.com
VSathe@perkinscoie.com
PMcKeever@perkinscoie.com

PATENT OWNER: (via electronic transmission)

Christopher Coulson
Clifford Ulrich
KENYON & KENYON LLP
ccoulson@kenyon.com
culrich@kenyon.com