Trials@uspto.gov
571-272-7822

Paper: 26
Date: November 10, 2025

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

X CORPORATION,
Petitioner,
v.

STERLING COMPUTERS CORPORATION,
Patent Owner.

IPR2025-00299
Patent 7,716,217 B2

Before KARL D. EASTHOM, AMBER L. HAGY, and BACH V. HOANG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HOANG, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION
Granting Petitioner's Motion for
Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Ethan L. Plail
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On November 4, 2025, Petitioner filed a motion for admission *pro hac vice* of Mr. Ethan L. Plail in the above-captioned proceeding. Paper 25 ("Mot."). The Motion was accompanied by a Declaration from Mr. Plail (Ex. 1047). Mandatory Notices and a Power of Attorney listing Mr. Plail were filed. Papers 1; 2.

Pursuant to 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 its notice authorizing motions for *pro hac vice* admission, the Board requires 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 this proceeding. *See* Paper 3, 3.

Based on the facts set forth in the Motion and the accompanying Declaration, we conclude that Mr. Plail has sufficient legal qualifications to represent Petitioner in this proceeding, that he has demonstrated sufficient familiarity with the subject matter of this proceeding, that he meets all other requirements for admission *pro hac vice*, and that Petitioner's intent to be represented by counsel with litigation experience is warranted. Accordingly, Petitioner has established good cause for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Plail, who will be permitted to serve only as back-up counsel. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).

ORDER

It is:

ORDERED that Petitioner's motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Mr. Ethan L. Plail is *granted*, and Mr. Plail is authorized to represent Petitioner only as back-up counsel in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner is to continue to have a registered practitioner as lead counsel in this proceeding;

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Plail is to comply with the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's 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. Plail is subject to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), and the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth at 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101–11.901.

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

FOR PETITIONER:

David Okano
Yar Chaikovsky
WHITE & CASE LLP
david.okano@whitecase.com
yar.chaikovsky@whitecase.com

PATENT OWNER:

Devan V. Padmanabhan
Michelle E. Dawson
Padmanabhan & Dawson, PLLC
devan@paddalawgroup.com
michelle@paddalawgroup.com