

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

K/S HIMPP,
Petitioner,

v.

BRAGI GMBH,
Patent Owner.

IPR2023-01205
Patent 10,397,688 B2

Before LARRY J. HUME, STACEY G. WHITE, and GARTH D. BAER,
Administrative Patent Judges.

WHITE, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ORDER

Granting Patent Owner's Motion for
Pro Hac Vice Admission of Bradley Jarrett.
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On August 26, 2024, Patent Owner filed a Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Bradley Jarrett. Paper 20 (“Motion”). Patent Owner also submitted a Declaration from Mr. Jarrett in support of the Motion. Ex. 2003 (“Declaration”). Petitioner has not opposed the Motion. For the reasons provided below, Patent Owner’s Motion is *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 Motion and the accompanying Declaration, we conclude that Mr. Jarrett has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Patent Owner in this proceeding, has demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of this proceeding, and meets all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Paper 20; Ex. 2003. Accordingly, Patent Owner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Jarrett.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s Motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Bradley Jarrett is *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Patent Owner is to continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Jarrett is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Jarrett be familiar with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board Consolidated Trial Practice Guide¹ (84 Fed. Reg. 64,280 (Nov. 21, 2019)), and comply with the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations²; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Jarrett 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>.

² Mr. Jarrett refers to “part 37 C.F.R. Part 42,” rather than Part 42 of *Title 37* of the Code of Federal Regulations. Ex. 2003 ¶ 5. We deem this to be harmless error.

IPR2023-01205
Patent 10,397,688 B2

FOR PETITIONER:

Haixia Lin
Brian Lambson
Trishan Efram
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
haixia.lin@wilmerhale.com
brian.lambson@wilmerhale.com
trishan.esram@wilmerhale.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Scott W. Hejny
Richard A. Kamprath
MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.
shejny@mckoolsmith.com
rkamprath@mckoolsmith.com