Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper 23
Entered: April 18, 2024

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

ZOHO CORPORATION and
ZOHO CORPORATION PVT., LTD.,
Petitioner,

v.

MEETRIX IP, LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-00371 (Patent 8,339,997 B2)
IPR2023-00377 (Patent 9,253,332 B2)
IPR2023-00378 (Patent 9,094,525 B2)
IPR2023-00379 (Patent 9,094,525 B2)
IPR2023-00380 (Patent 9,843,612 B2)
IPR2023-00382 (Patent 9,843,612 B2)

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, BRIAN J. MCNAMARA, CHARLES J. BOUDREAU, and KARA L. SZPONDOWSKI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.[1]

PER CURIAM.

ORDER[2]
Conditionally Granting Patent Owner's Motions for
Pro Hac Vice Admission of Michael D. French
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

[1] This listing of Administrative Patent Judges does not reflect an expanded panel under SOP 1 § III.M. Rather, this Order addresses multiple proceedings, each of which involves only three Administrative Patent Judges.

[2] This Order applies to each of the listed cases. The parties must obtain prior approval to use this caption style.

Patent Owner filed Motions requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Michael D. French in each of the above-identified proceedings. Paper 21.[3] Patent Owner also submitted Declarations from Mr. French in support of the Motions. Ex. 2003. Petitioner states in an email dated April 15, 2024 that it does not oppose the Motions.

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. French 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

[3] For purposes of expediency, we cite to Papers and Exhibits filed in IPR2023-00371. Patent Owner filed similar Papers and Exhibits in IPR2023-00377, IPR2023-00378, IPR2023-00379, IPR2023-00380, and IPR2023-00382.

pro hac vice. *See* Declarations. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. French.

Upon review of the record before us, we note that a Power of Attorney in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b) has not been submitted for Mr. French. In view thereof, and for the reasons set forth below, Patent Owner's Motions are *conditionally granted* and are to be effective after Patent Owner files the aforementioned Power of Attorney in each of the above-identified proceedings.

In addition, Patent Owner has not filed updated mandatory notices identifying Mr. French as back-up attorney. Therefore, Patent Owner must file updated mandatory notices in each of the above-identified proceedings identifying Mr. French as back-up counsel in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3).

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Michael D. French are *conditionally granted*, provided that within ten (10) business days of the date of this order, Patent Owner must submit a Power of Attorney for Mr. French in each of the above-identified proceedings in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(b);

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner shall submit an updated mandatory notice identifying Mr. French as back-up counsel in each of the above-identified proceedings, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 42.8(b)(3);

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. French is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in the above-identified proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. French comply with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide[4] (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. French 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.*

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

IPR2023-00371 (Patent 8,339,997 B2)
IPR2023-00377 (Patent 9,253,332 B2)
IPR2023-00378 (Patent 9,094,525 B2)
IPR2023-00379 (Patent 9,094,525 B2)
IPR2023-00380 (Patent 9,843,612 B2)
IPR2023-00382 (Patent 9,843,612 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Hector J. Ribera
C.J. Alice Chuang
MARTON RIBERA SCHUMANN & CHANG LLP
hector@martonribera.com
cjalice@martonribera.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Gregory S. Donahue
Andrew G. DiNovo
DINOVO PRICE LLP
gdonahue@dinovoprice.com
adinovo@dinovoprice.com