Trials@uspto.gov
Tel: 571-272-7822

Paper 18
Entered: October 1, 2024

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

DROPBOX, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

MOTION OFFENSE, LLC,
Petitioner.

IPR2024-00286
IPR2024-00287
Patent 11,611,520 B1[1]

Before THOMAS L. GIANNETTI, NORMAN H. BEAMER, and SCOTT RAEVSKY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BEAMER, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Petitioner's Motion for *Pro Hac Vice*
Admission of Gregory H. Lantier and Liv L. Herriot
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

---

[1] This Order applies to each of the above-identified proceedings. We issue one Order to be entered in each proceeding. The parties are not authorized to use this style caption unless later permitted.

On August 29, 2024, Petitioner filed motions (Papers 16–17, "Motions")[2] requesting *pro hac vice* admission of Gregory H. Lantier and Liv L. Herriot. Petitioner filed declarations (Exs. 0124–25. "Declarations")[3] from Attorneys Lantier and Herriot in support of the Motions. The Motions are identified as being unopposed.

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 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 Attorneys Lantier and Herriot have sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Petitioner in this proceeding, that Attorneys Lantier and Herriot have demonstrated sufficient litigation experience and familiarity with the subject matter of this proceeding, and that Attorneys Lantier and Herriot meet all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*. *See* Declarations. Accordingly, Petitioner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Attorneys Lantier and Herriot.

In view of the above, it is

---

[2] We cite to papers filed in IPR2024-00286. Similar papers were filed in IPR2024-00287.

[3] We cite to the declarations filed in IPR2024-00286. Similar declarations were filed in IPR2024-00287.

ORDERED that Petitioner's Motions for *pro hac vice* admission of Attorneys Lantier and Herriot are *granted*;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner continue to have a registered practitioner represent it as lead counsel for the instant proceeding, but that Attorneys Lantier and Herriot are authorized to act as back-up counsel;

FURTHER ORDERED that Attorneys Lantier and Herriot comply with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's 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 Attorneys Lantier and Herriot are 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.

PETITIONER:

Scott Bertulli
Scott.bertulli@wilmerhale.com

Trishan Esram
Trishan.esram@wilmerhale.com

PETITIONER:

George Gordon
andrew@agrodonlawfirm.com