

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

AKAMAI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

LIMELIGHT NETWORKS, INC.,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-01306
Patent 8,775,661 B2

Before GREGG I. ANDERSON, JENNIFER MEYER CHAGNON, and
JASON W. MELVIN, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

ANDERSON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER
Granting Petitioner's Motion for Admission
Pro Hac Vice Dana O. Burwell
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

On January 5, 2018, Petitioner, Akamai Technologies, Inc., filed an Unopposed Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* of Dana O. Burwell (Paper 13, “Motion,” or “Mot.”). The Motion was accompanied by a Declaration of Dana O. Burwell in Support of Motion for Admission *Pro Hac Vice* (Ex. 1009).

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), we 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 motions for *pro hac vice*, we require the moving party to provide a statement of facts showing there is good cause for us to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*, and an affidavit or declaration of the individual seeking to appear in the proceeding.

Upon review of the Motion and supporting evidence, we determine that Petitioner has demonstrated that Dana O. Burwell has sufficient legal and technical qualifications to represent Petitioner in the above-identified proceedings. We also recognize that there is a need for Petitioner to have him involved in this proceeding.

Accordingly, Petitioner has established that there is good cause for admitting Dana O. Burwell.

It is

ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission of Dana O. Burwell is *granted*; Mr. Burwell is authorized to represent Petitioner as back-up counsel in the above-identified proceedings;

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

Case IPR2017-01306
Patent 8,775,661 B2

FURTHER ORDERED that Dana O. Burwell is to comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials, as set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, and to be 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.*

PETITIONER:

Grant K. Rowan
Mary V. Sooter
Peter Dichiara
Zachary P. Piccolomini
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
Grant.Rowan@wilmerhale.com
Mindy.Sooter@wilmerhale.com
Peter.Dichiara@wilmerhale.com
Zachary.Piccolomini@wilmerhale.com

David H. Judson
THE LAW OFFICES OF DAVID H. JUDSON
mail@davidjudson.com

PATENT OWNER:

Barry J. Schindler
Heath Briggs
Lennie A. Bersh
Vimal Kapadia
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
SchindlerB@gtlaw.com
Limelight-ips@gtlaw.com
BriggsH@gtlaw.com
BershL@gtlaw.com
KapadiaV@gtlaw.com

Case IPR2017-01306
Patent 8,775,661 B2