Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper: 11
Date: January 5, 2023

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

VL COLLECTIVE IP LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2022-01086
Patent 8,605,794 B2

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, JEFFREY S. SMITH, and PATRICK M. BOUCHER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BOUCHER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Patent Owner's Motion for Pro Hac Vice Admission of Jaime F. Cardenas-Navia
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On December 27, 2022, Patent Owner filed a motion requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Jaime F. Cardenas-Navia. Paper 10 ("Motion"). Patent Owner submitted a Declaration from Mr. Cardenas-Navia in support of the Motion. Ex. 2006.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), we may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause. In authorizing a motion for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires the moving party to provide 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 the proceeding. *See* Paper 5, 2 (citing *Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, Case IPR2013-00639 (PTAB Oct. 15, 2013) (Paper 7) (representative "Order – Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission")).

Based on the facts set forth in the Motion and the accompanying Declaration, we conclude that Mr. Cardenas-Navia has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in this proceeding, that Mr. Cardenas-Navia has demonstrated sufficient familiarity with the subject matter of this proceeding, and that Mr. Cardenas-Navia meets all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Ex. 2006. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Cardenas-Navia.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motion (Paper 10) for *pro hac vice* admission of Jaime F. Cardenas-Navia is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner must file an updated mandatory notice identifying Mr. Cardenas-Navia as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3);

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for the instant proceeding, but that Mr. Cardenas-Navia is authorized to act as back-up counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Cardenas-Navia comply with the Consolidated Trial Practice Guide[1] (84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019)), 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. Cardenas-Navia 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*.

[1] Available at https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated.

PETITIONER:

Raghav Bajaj
David McCombs
HAYNES & BOONE LLP
raghav.bajaj.ipr@haynesboone.com
david.mccombs.ipr@haynesboone.com

Jung Hahm
Roshan Mansinghani
UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC
roshan@unifiedpatents.com
jung@unifiedpatents.com

PATENT OWNER:

Christine E. Lehman
Michael G. Flanigan
REICHMAN JORGENSEN LEHMAN &
FELDBERG LLP
clehman@reichmanjorgensen.com
mflanigan@reichmanjorgensen.com