

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

JENAM TECH, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00929 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00930 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00931 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)
IPR2023-00932 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)

Before STEPHEN E. BELISLE, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER¹

Granting Patent Owner's Motions for
Pro Hac Vice Admission of Derek Dahlgren
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

¹ This Order addresses issues that are the same in the identified cases. We exercise our discretion to issue one Order to be filed in each case. The parties, however, are not authorized to use this filing style in subsequent papers.

IPR2023-00929 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00930 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00931 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)
IPR2023-00932 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)

Patent Owner filed motions requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Derek Dahlgren in each of the above-identified proceedings (collectively “Motions”). Paper 7.² Patent Owner also submitted Declarations from Derek Dahlgren in support of the Motions (collectively “Declarations”). Ex. 2001. Petitioner did not oppose the Motions within the requisite time period.

For the reasons provided below, the Motions are *granted*.

In accordance with 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. 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 Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, 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 Motions and the accompanying Declarations, we conclude that Mr. Dahlgren has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in these proceedings, has demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of these proceedings, and meets all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Declarations. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established

² For purposes of expediency, we cite to Papers and Exhibits filed in IPR2023-00929. Patent Owner filed similar Papers and Exhibits in IPR2023-00930, IPR2023-00931, and IPR2023-00932.

IPR2023-00929 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00930 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00931 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)
IPR2023-00932 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)

good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Dahlgren. Mr. Dahlgren will be permitted to serve as back-up counsel only. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

We note that Patent Owner filed a Power of Attorney including Mr. Dahlgren in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b). IPR2023-00929, Paper 5. Patent Owner has also filed Mandatory Notices identifying Mr. Dahlgren as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3). IPR2023-00929, Paper 4.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Derek Dahlgren are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Dahlgren is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Dahlgren comply with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide³ (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 37,⁴ Code of Federal Regulations; and

³ Available at <https://www.uspto.gov/TrialPracticeGuideConsolidated>.

⁴ The Motion and Declaration each state that Mr. Dahlgren 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 the C.F.R." Motion 2; Declaration ¶ 5. We note, however, that the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials are set forth in Part 42 of 37 C.F.R., and it is those rules to which Mr. Dahlgren will be subject.

IPR2023-00929 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00930 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00931 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)
IPR2023-00932 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Dahlgren 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.*

IPR2023-00929 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00930 (Patent 11,050,856 B1)
IPR2023-00931 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)
IPR2023-00932 (Patent 11,064,058 B1)

FOR PETITIONER:

Naveen Modi
Quadeer Ahmed
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
naveenmodi@paulhastings.com
quadeerahmed@paulhastings.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Timothy Devlin
DEVLIN LAW FIRM LLC
tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com