

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

---

TELESIGN CORPORATION,  
Petitioner,

v.

TWILIO INC.,  
Patent Owner.

---

Case IPR2017-01976 (Patent 8,837,465 B2)  
Case IPR2017-01977 (Patent 8,755,376 B2)  
Case IPR2017-01978 (Patent 8,306,021 B2)<sup>1</sup>

---

Before ROBERT J. WEINSCHENK, KIMBERLY MCGRAW, and  
SCOTT C. MOORE, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

WEINSCHENK, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION  
Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission  
37 C.F.R. § 42.10

---

<sup>1</sup> This Decision pertains to all of these cases. Therefore, we exercise our discretion to issue a single Decision to be filed in each case. The parties are not authorized to use this style heading for any subsequent papers.

IPR2017-01976 (Patent 8,837,465 B2)  
IPR2017-01977 (Patent 8,755,376 B2)  
IPR2017-01978 (Patent 8,306,021 B2)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Patent Owner filed a motion for *pro hac vice* admission of Jay B. Schiller in the above-listed proceedings. Paper 7 (“Motion” or “Mot.”).<sup>2</sup> Petitioner did not oppose the Motion. For the following reasons, the Motion is *granted*.

## II. ANALYSIS

Counsel may be admitted *pro hac vice* upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel is a registered practitioner. 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c). Specifically, if lead counsel is a registered practitioner, back-up counsel may be permitted to appear *pro hac vice* “upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.” *Id.* For the reasons set forth in the Motion and the accompanying affidavit of Mr. Schiller, we find that good cause exists to admit Mr. Schiller *pro hac vice* in the above-listed proceedings.

## III. ORDER

In consideration of the foregoing, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the Motion is *granted*, and Mr. Jay B. Schiller is authorized to represent Patent Owner as back-up counsel in the above-listed proceedings;

FURTHER ORDERED that a registered practitioner will continue to represent Patent Owner as lead counsel in the above-listed proceedings; and

FURTHER ORDERED that Mr. Schiller is to comply with the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in Part 42 of Title 37, Code of

---

<sup>2</sup> We cite to the record in IPR2017-01976.

IPR2017-01976 (Patent 8,837,465 B2)

IPR2017-01977 (Patent 8,755,376 B2)

IPR2017-01978 (Patent 8,306,021 B2)

Federal Regulations, and the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide, and is subject to the USPTO's Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et seq.*, and to the USPTO's disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a).

IPR2017-01976 (Patent 8,837,465 B2)

IPR2017-01977 (Patent 8,755,376 B2)

IPR2017-01978 (Patent 8,306,021 B2)

PETITIONER:

Jesse J. Camacho

Elena K. McFarland

Christine Guastello

Mary J. Peal

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

jjcamacho@shb.com

emcfarland@shb.com

cguastello@shb.com

mpeal@shb.com

PATENT OWNER:

Wayne Stacy

Sarah Guske

Michelle Jacobson Eber

Jay B. Schiller

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

wayne.stacy@bakerbotts.com

sarah.guske@bakerbotts.com

michelle.eber@bakerbotts.com

jay.schiller@bakerbotts.com