

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MUNCHKIN, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SKIP HOP, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2016-00536
Patent 9,060,653 B2

Before MICHAEL R. ZECHER, BRIAN J. McNAMARA, and
DANIEL J. GALLIGAN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

GALLIGAN, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION

Granting Patent Owner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice*
Admission of Mr. Joel T. Beres
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

As authorized by the Notice of Filing Date Accorded to the Petition (Paper 3), Patent Owner, Skip Hop, Inc., filed a Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Mr. Joel T. Beres (Paper 6, “Mot.”). Patent Owner also filed an affidavit of Mr. Beres in support of the Motion. Paper 7.¹ Petitioner does not oppose the Motion. Patent Owner’s Motion is *granted*.

On this record, we determine that Mr. Beres has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner, and that there is a need for Patent Owner to have its counsel who represents it in a related district court case involved in this proceeding. Mot. 1; Paper 7 ¶¶ 1–9.

Accordingly, Patent Owner has established that there is good cause for the *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Beres in this proceeding.

It is

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Mr. Joel T. Beres is *granted*, and Mr. Beres is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel in IPR2016-00536 only;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in this *inter partes* review proceeding; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Beres is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, 77 Fed. Reg. 48756 (Aug. 14, 2012), and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Title 37, Part 42 of the

¹ Patent Owner filed the affidavit of Mr. Beres as a paper in this case, rather than as a separate exhibit. The parties are cautioned that, going forward, such evidence should be filed as an exhibit. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.63(a) (“Evidence consists of affidavits, transcripts of depositions, documents, and things. All evidence must be filed in the form of an exhibit.”).

Code of Federal Regulations; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Beres 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.*

For PETITIONER:

A. Justin Poplin
Robert Evora
LATHROP & GAGE LLP
patent@lathropgage.com
Robert.Evora@Munchkin.com

For PATENT OWNER:

Stephen Weyer
STITES & HARBISON, PLLC
sweyer@stites.com