

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

META PLATFORMS, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

COGMEDIA LLC,
Patent Owner.

IPR2026-00247 (Patent 9,817,562 B2)
IPR2026-00248 (Patent 10,664,141 B2)
IPR2026-00249 (Patent 11,036,371 B2)

Before KALYAN K. DESHPANDE, *Chief Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER

Granting Patent Owner's Motions for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of
Dave R. Gunter
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

IPR2026-00247 (Patent 9,817,562 B2)
IPR2026-00248 (Patent 10,664,141 B2)
IPR2026-00249 (Patent 11,036,371 B2)

In each of the above-captioned proceedings, Cogmedia LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed an unopposed Motion requesting admission *pro hac vice* of Dave R. Gunter (Paper 6) and a supporting Declaration of Dave R. Gunter (Ex. 2001).¹ Patent Owner’s Motions are *granted*.

Accordingly, it is:

ORDERED that Patent Owner’s Motions are *granted*;²

FURTHER ORDERED that Dave R. Gunter will be authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel only in these proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Dave R. Gunter be familiar with the PTAB Trial Practice Guide,³ comply with the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in 37 C.F.R. part 42,⁴ and be subject to the Office’s

¹ Citations are to the record in IPR2026-00247. Patent Owner filed similar papers and exhibits in IPR2026-00248 and IPR2026-00249.

² Patent Owner filed the Motions less than twenty-one days after service of the Petitions, but “[a] motion or notice seeking *pro hac vice* recognition shall not be filed earlier than 21 days after service of the petition, which is the time for filing patent owner mandatory notices.” Paper 3 at 3 (emphasis added). This oversight is excused because Patent Owner certifies in each case that the Motion was served on Petitioner’s counsel (Paper 6 at 4), and sufficient time has elapsed for Petitioner to oppose the Motions, which it has not.

³ Patent Trial and Appeal Board, Trial Practice Guide (Dec. 2025), *available at* <https://www.uspto.gov/patents/ptab/trial-practice-guide>.

⁴ The Declarations state that “I have read and agree to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rule of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations” (Ex. 2001 ¶ 6), but an individual seeking *pro hac vice* admission must attest that “[t]he individual seeking to appear has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials *set forth in 37 CFR part 42*.” Paper 3 at 4–5 (emphasis added). The Declarations also state that “I submit to be subject to the PTO’s code of professional

IPR2026-00247 (Patent 9,817,562 B2)
IPR2026-00248 (Patent 10,664,141 B2)
IPR2026-00249 (Patent 11,036,371 B2)

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.*

responsibility set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 10.20 *et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a)” (Ex. 2001 ¶ 7), but an individual seeking *pro hac vice* admission must attest that “[t]he individual will be subject to *the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct* set forth in *37 CFR 11.101 et seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 CFR 11.19(a).” Paper 3 at 4–5 (emphasis added). These oversights are excused.

IPR2026-00247 (Patent 9,817,562 B2)
IPR2026-00248 (Patent 10,664,141 B2)
IPR2026-00249 (Patent 11,036,371 B2)

FOR PETITIONER:

Lisa K. Nguyen
David M. Tennant
PAUL HASTINGS LLP
PH-META-Cogmedia@paulhastings.com

FOR PATENT OWNER:

Alexander N. Yow
Dave R. Gunter
FRIEDMAN, SUDER & COOKE
ayow@fsclaw.com
gunter@fsclaw.com