Trials@uspto.gov
571.272.7822

Paper 15
Entered: October 2, 2015

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

FORTINET, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SOPHOS INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2015-00617 (Patent 6,195,587 B1)
Case IPR2015-00618 (Patent 8,261,344 B2)
Case IPR2015-00619 (Patent 8,607,347 B2)[1]

Before BRYAN F. MOORE, PETER P. CHEN, and
MICHELLE N. WORMMEESTER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WORMMEESTER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Decision Granting Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Jordan R. Jaffe
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

[1] This order addresses issues that are the same in all identified cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one order to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading in subsequent papers.

Petitioner has filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Jordan R. Jaffe in each of these proceedings. Paper 14.[2] Each motion is supported by an affidavit of Mr. Jaffe. Ex. 1021.

The Board has reviewed the submissions and determined that the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 42.10 have been met and there is good cause to admit Mr. Jaffe *pro hac vice*.[3]

ORDER

It is therefore

ORDERED that Petitioner's motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Jordan R. Jaffe in each of these proceedings is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Jaffe is authorized to appear as back-up counsel for Petitioner in each of these proceedings, but he may not act as lead counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for each of these proceedings;

---

[2] Paper and exhibit numbers refer to Case IPR2015-00617. Corresponding motions and affidavits were filed in each of the other cases.

[3] According to the "Order -- Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission" in Case IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, Mr. Jaffe's affidavit must provide a statement acknowledging that he will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 CFR §§ 11.101 *et seq*. In his affidavit, Mr. Jaffe incorrectly cites 37 CFR §§ 10.20 *et seq*. with respect to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct. Pursuant to this order, by appearing *pro hac vice* in this case Mr. Jaffe agrees 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*.

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Jaffe 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 Mr. Jaffe is 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.*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner shall file updated mandatory notices, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3), providing updated information regarding back-up counsel.

For Petitioner:

Jason Liu
Robert Kang
Jared Newton
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN
jasonliu@quinnemanuel.com
robertkang@quinnemanuel.com
jarednewton@quinnemanuel.com

For Patent Owner:

James M. Heintz
Gianni Minutoli
Nicholas Panno
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
jim.heintz@dlapiper.com
SophosFortinetIPR@dlapiper.com
nicholas.panno@dlapiper.com