

What's New with Privilege: Patent Agents, In-House Counsel, and More

David Hricik
Professor, Mercer University School of Law
Of Counsel,
Taylor English Duma LLP

February 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Choice of Law	3
a. Choice of Law for Discipline and Legal Ethics	3
b. Choice of Law for Privilege	4
2. Scope of Authorized Practice of Patent Agents	11
3. The Patent Agent-Client and Unlicensed In-House Counsel Privileges	14
a. Patent Agents: The USPTO Position and Case Law Before the 2-1 Panel Decision in <i>Queen's University</i> on the Existence of a Patent Agent-Client Privilege	14
b. The Split Panel in <i>Queen's University</i>	14
c. Texas Rejects <i>Queen's University</i>	18
d. Other Case Law After <i>Queen's University</i>	19
e. In-House Privilege	20
4. When Must a Patent Attorney Supervise a Patent Agent or In-House Counsel who is not Licensed to Practice in a State but who is Registered Under State Law to do so?	20
a. If Patent Agent is Acting Within the Scope of Authority to Practice Patent Law, Supervision is Needed Only to Support a Privilege Only if <i>Queen's University</i> Does not Control; if a Patent Agent is Acting Outside Scope of Authority to Practice Patent Law, a Patent Attorney Must Supervise Both to Avoid the Unauthorized Practice of Law, and Perhaps to Fulfill the Obligation to Supervise Non-Practitioners, and to Provide a Basis for Attorney-Client Privilege to Subsist	22
c. What Does "Supervision" Mean in the Privilege Context?	25
d. What About Communications from Patent Agent to Lawyer, But not Client, or After Issuance and Not Related to Maintenance Fees or Post-Grant Proceedings?	26
e. Conclusion	26
5. The Dangerous Confusion About Common Interest Privilege and Joint Attorney-Client Communications	27

1. Choice of Law

a. Choice of Law for Discipline and Legal Ethics

This paper discusses ethical issues and also privilege issues. Different choice of law analyses may be required for those issues, and in a particular case the analysis may be different than presented here, which is, however, typical.

The primary ethical issue discussed in this paper is the duty of a lawyer to not engage in the unauthorized practice of law, to ensure others are not doing so, and to supervise non-lawyers working on behalf of the lawyer when they are doing so, or to be supervised when the lawyer is doing so. Those related issues typically would arise in a disciplinary proceeding, an issue where the unauthorized practice of law is alleged, in a fight over privilege, or in a malpractice suit.

A disciplinary proceeding could be brought by a state bar or the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (“OED”) at the United States Patent & Trademark Office (“USPTO”). As the following shows, no matter which forum a disciplinary proceeding is brought in, the OED or a state bar should apply the same set of rules if the conduct consists of practicing before the USPTO.

As for the OED, its disciplinary authority is stated in this rule:

All practitioners engaged in practice before the Office... are subject to the disciplinary jurisdiction of the Office..... A person not registered or recognized to practice before the Office is also subject to the disciplinary authority of the Office if the person provides or offers to provide any legal services before the Office.

“Proceeding before the Office” is itself defined: “Proceeding before the Office means an application for patent, an application for reissue, a reexamination, a protest, a public use matter, an inter partes patent matter, correction of a patent, correction of inventorship, an application to register a trademark, an inter partes trademark matter, an appeal, a petition, and any other matter that is pending before the Office.”

So, plainly a patent practitioner who is involved in a proceeding before the Office can be disciplined by the OED. Another subsection of that same USPTO regulation in title 37 of the CFR identifies what is a ground for OED discipline:

- (i) Conviction of a serious crime;
- (ii) Discipline on ethical grounds imposed in another jurisdiction or disciplinary disqualification from participating in or appearing before any Federal program or agency;
- (iii) Failure to comply with any order of a Court disciplining a practitioner, or any final decision of the USPTO Director in a disciplinary matter;
- (iv) *Violation of any USPTO Rule of Professional Conduct*; or
- (v) Violation of the oath or declaration taken by the practitioner. See § 11.8.

(37 C.F.R. 11.19 *emph. added*.) So, unless some other agency or court has already disciplined a practitioner, or one of the other enumerated acts has occurred, the OED must find that a practitioner

violated a USPTO Rule.

What if a state bar sought to discipline a lawyer for conduct occurring before the USPTO? While the state bar will have power to discipline a lawyer for conduct no matter where it occurs, most states have choice of law rules expressly for discipline. While they vary, the most common ones follow ABA Model Rule of Professional Conduct 8.5. That rule gives a licensing state authority to discipline a lawyer no matter where his conduct occurs, but makes it clear that the bar may or may not apply its rules to that conduct, depending on where the conduct occurred or other circumstances. Model Rule 8.5(b), as adopted by many states, provides:

In any exercise of the disciplinary authority of this jurisdiction, the rules of professional conduct to be applied shall be as follows:

- (1) *for conduct in connection with a matter pending before a tribunal*, the rules of the jurisdiction in which the tribunal sits, unless the rules of the tribunal provide otherwise; and
- (2) for any other conduct, the rules of the jurisdiction in which the lawyer's conduct occurred, or, if the predominant effect of the conduct is in a different jurisdiction, the rules of that jurisdiction shall be applied to the conduct. A lawyer shall not be subject to discipline if the lawyer's conduct conforms to the rules of a jurisdiction in which the lawyer reasonably believes the predominant effect of the lawyer's conduct will occur.

Significantly, (a) some states have rules that say that a lawyer must *appear* in the tribunal for subpart (a) to apply, and (b) complex problems arise if the matter is not pending, such as activities occurring before a patent application is filed.

To conclude, at least once a matter is pending before the USPTO and in most states, a practitioner can rely solely upon the USPTO Rules to determine what is “ethical” or not, in terms of discipline. Finally, if state law somehow does apply to conduct about a matter pending before the USPTO, then it may be that a preemption analysis is required, because the USPTO Rules only narrowly preempt state law to the contrary.

With respect to malpractice, many states hold that breach of an applicable rule is admissible, but to varying extents. Usually, states provide that breach of an applicable rule can be evidence of breach of the standard of care. *See generally* Stephen E. Kalish, *How to Encourage Lawyers to Be Ethical: Do Not Use the Ethics Codes as a Basis for Regular Law Decisions*, 13 GEO. J. LEGAL ETHICS 649 (2000). A court in a malpractice case that allows admission of such evidence should, for obvious reasons, follow the analysis above.

b. Choice of Law for Privilege

Attorney-client privilege is simply a rule about admissibility. In federal court, in federal question cases federal law determines whether a privilege exists. That analysis begins with Rule 501 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, which states:

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](https://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: What's New with Privilege: Patent Agents, In-House Counsel, and More

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
12th Annual Advanced Patent Law Institute session
"Privilege in Patent Cases: What's New?"