

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE DIRECTOR OF THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Benjamin Alan Balsler, Sr.	)	Proceeding No. D2025-24
	)	
Respondent	)	
<hr style="border: 0.5px solid black;"/>	)	

**FINAL ORDER**

The Acting Deputy General Counsel for Enrollment and Discipline and the Acting Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (“OED Director”) for the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO” or “Office”) and Mr. Benjamin Alan Balsler, Sr. (“Respondent”), by counsel, have submitted a Proposed Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”) to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO Director”) for approval.

The Agreement, which resolves all disciplinary action by the USPTO arising from the Joint Stipulated Facts set forth below, is hereby approved. This Final Order sets forth the parties’ stipulated facts, legal conclusions, and sanctions.

**Jurisdiction**

1. At all times relevant hereto, Respondent of New Orleans, Louisiana, has been a registered patent attorney (USPTO Registration No. 58,169) and an attorney in good standing in the State of Georgia (Bar No. 035833). As a registered practitioner, Respondent is subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, 37 C.F.R. § 11.101 *et seq.*
2. The USPTO Director has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 2(b)(2)(D) and 32, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.19, 11.20, and 11.26.

**Background**

Practice Before the USPTO in Patent Matters

3. Practice before the Office includes, but is not limited to, law-related service that comprehends any matter connected with the presentation to the Office or any of its officers or employees relating to a client’s rights, privileges, duties, or responsibilities under the laws or regulations administered by the Office for the grant of a patent. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 11.5(b). Such presentations include preparing necessary documents in contemplation of filing the documents with the Office, corresponding and communicating with the Office, and representing a client through documents or at interviews, hearings, and meetings, as well as communicating with and

advising a client concerning matters pending or contemplated to be presented before the Office. *See id.*<sup>1</sup>

4. Practice before the Office in patent matters includes, but is not limited to, preparing or prosecuting any patent application; consulting with or giving advice to a client in contemplation of filing a patent application or other document with the Office; drafting the specification or claims of a patent application; drafting an amendment or reply to a communication from the Office that may require written argument to establish the patentability of a claimed invention; drafting a reply to a communication from the Office regarding a patent application; and drafting a communication for an interference, derivation, and/or reexamination proceeding a petition, an appeal to or any other proceeding before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, or any other patent proceeding. Registration to practice before the Office in patent matters authorizes the performance of those services that are reasonably necessary and incident to the preparation and prosecution of patent applications or other proceedings before the Office involving a patent application or patent in which the practitioner is authorized to participate. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 11.5(b)(1).

#### USPTO Patent Signature Rules

5. The USPTO's signature requirements for patent correspondence (*e.g.*, entity status determinations, application data sheets, and inventor declarations) are found, in part, at 37 C.F.R. § 1.4(d), which states:

(1) **Handwritten signature.** A design patent practitioner must indicate their design patent practitioner status by placing the word "design" (in any format) adjacent to their handwritten signature. Each piece of correspondence, except as provided in paragraphs (d)(2) through (5) and (f) of this section, filed in an application, patent file, or other proceeding in the Office that requires a person's signature, must:

(i) Be an original, that is, have an original handwritten signature personally signed, in permanent dark ink or its equivalent, by that person; or

(ii) Be a direct or indirect copy, such as a photocopy or facsimile transmission (§ 1.6(d)), of an original. In the event that a copy of the original is filed, the original should be retained as evidence of authenticity. If a question of authenticity arises, the Office may require submission of the original.

(2) **S-signature.** An S-signature is a signature inserted between forward slash marks, but not a handwritten signature as defined by paragraph (d)(1) of this section. An S-signature includes any signature made by electronic or mechanical means, and any other mode of making or applying a signature other than a handwritten signature as provided for in paragraph (d)(1) of this section.

---

<sup>1</sup> Of course, nothing in 37 C.F.R. § 11.5(b) proscribes a practitioner from employing or retaining non-practitioner assistants under the supervision of the practitioner to assist the practitioner in matters pending or contemplated to be presented before the Office. *See id.*

Correspondence being filed in the Office in paper, by facsimile transmission as provided in § 1.6(d), or via the USPTO patent electronic filing system as an attachment as provided in § 1.6(a)(4), for a patent application, patent, or a reexamination or supplemental examination proceeding may be S-signature signed instead of being personally signed (*i.e.*, with a handwritten signature) as provided for in paragraph (d)(1) of this section. The requirements for an S-signature under this paragraph (d)(2) of this section are as follows.

(i) The S-signature must consist only of letters, or Arabic numerals, or both, with appropriate spaces and commas, periods, apostrophes, or hyphens for punctuation, and the person signing the correspondence must insert his or her own S-signature with a first single forward slash mark before, and a second single forward slash mark after, the S-signature (*e.g.*, /Dr. James T. Jones, Jr./); and

(ii) A patent practitioner (§ 1.32(a)(1)), signing pursuant to § 1.33(b)(1) or (2), must supply their registration number either as part of the S-signature or immediately below or adjacent to the S-signature. The hash (#) character may only be used as part of the S-signature when appearing before a practitioner's registration number; otherwise, the hash character may not be used in an S-signature. A design patent practitioner must additionally indicate their design patent practitioner status by placing the word "design" (in any format) adjacent to the last forward slash of their S-signature.

(iii) The signer's name must be:

(A) Presented in printed or typed form preferably immediately below or adjacent the S-signature, and

(B) Reasonably specific enough so that the identity of the signer can be readily recognized.

(3) *Electronically submitted correspondence.* Correspondence permitted via the USPTO patent electronic filing system may be signed by a graphic representation of a handwritten signature as provided for in paragraph (d)(1) of this section or a graphic representation of an S-signature as provided for in paragraph (d)(2) of this section when it is submitted via the USPTO patent electronic filing system.

\* \* \*

*See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.4(d) (2025).<sup>2</sup> It is not disputed that, under the USPTO patent signature rules, only the named signatory may sign his or her name to a patent document.

---

<sup>2</sup> 37 C.F.R. § 1.4(d) was amended with the agency's creation of a category of persons authorized to represent others only in connection with design patent applications — *i.e.*, a design patent practitioner bar. The above quoted language includes the current signature provisions under § 1.4(d) relating to design patent practitioners even though such provisions were not in effect at the relevant times of this matter.

6. The impermissible entry of the purported signature of a registered practitioner by someone other than the practitioner actually or potentially adversely affects the integrity of the U.S. patent system.

7. Further, the impermissible entry of a signature in violation of USPTO rules of practice may result in the USPTO Director issuing sanctions against the patent applicant, including, for example, the termination of application proceedings. *See, e.g.*, redacted “Final Order – Impositions of Sanctions” in the USPTO article: “USPTO terminates patent application procedures for fraudulent use of signature,” which is available on the agency’s website at <https://www.uspto.gov/about-us/news-updates/uspto-terminates-patent-application-proceedings-fraudulent-use-signature>.

#### USPTO Subscriber Agreements

8. At all relevant times, the USPTO’s subscriber agreements relevant for patent filings did not permit the use of USPTO Public Key Infrastructure certificates by other than a registered practitioner’s employees who were under the direction and control of the practitioner. Moreover, the registered practitioner expressly agreed not to permit the use of such certificates in connection with the unauthorized practice of law. In 2018, registered practitioners could migrate their USPTO Public Key Infrastructure certificates to their USPTO.gov accounts and use the USPTO.gov account as the authentication method to access for patent electronic systems (EFS-WEB Registered and Private PAIR). Thereafter, registered practitioners could sponsor a USPTO.gov account for support staff, and sponsored support staff would then be able to access the patent electronic systems as registered users, under a registered practitioner’s authorization. However, the sponsored support person was required to be (a) the registered practitioner’s employee or an employee of the practitioner’s organization, (b) an individual under contract to the registered practitioner or the practitioner’s organization, or an employee of a contractor under contract to the registered practitioner or the practitioner’s organization, and (c) must not be a practitioner.

#### USPTO Patent Rules of Practice and the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct

9. At all relevant times, the rules governing practice before the Office in patent matters (*e.g.*, as set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations and in the USPTO Manual of Patent Examining Procedure) were available to all registered practitioners, including Respondent. All registered practitioners should know the rules governing practice before the Office in patent matters.

At all relevant times, the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct were available to all registered practitioners. All registered practitioners, including Respondent, should know the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct.

#### **Joint Stipulated Facts**

10. On October 29, 2003, Respondent was admitted to practice law in the State of Georgia. (Bar No. 035833).

11. On December 12, 2005, as a condition for registration to practice in patent matters before the USPTO, Respondent signed an Oath or Affirmation (Form PTO-1209) stating that he would "observe the laws and rules of practice of the United States Patent and Trademark Office."

12. On January 31, 2006, Respondent was registered as a patent attorney with the USPTO (Reg. No. 58,169).

13. Respondent acknowledges that he knew, or should have known, the rules governing practice before the Office in patent matters and knew, or should have known, of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct.

14. Since 2016, Respondent has worked as a registered practitioner at Next IP Law Group LLC, which is currently located in New Orleans, Louisiana.

15. Albert Cota was Respondent's uncle. Albert Cota was registered as a patent agent with the USPTO in 1979. In 1984, Albert Cota incorporated a business in California. In 1988, Albert Cota changed the name of his California business to "Patent Law, Inc." ("PLI").

16. Rocky Cota was Albert Cota's son and Respondent's cousin. Rocky Cota assisted Albert Cota in the prosecution of patents with PLI. Rocky Cota is not and never has been registered as a practitioner with the USPTO. Rocky Cota is not and never has been an attorney licensed to practice in the United States.

17. In May 2017, Albert Cota died. Following Albert Cota's death, Rocky Cota continued to prepare patent documents for PLI customers, sign Albert Cota's name to such documents, and file the documents with the USPTO using Albert Cota's electronic filing credentials. It is not disputed that such activities constituted practice before the USPTO in patent matters.

18. On April 3, 2018, OED informed Rocky Cota he was under investigation for unauthorized practice before the USPTO in patent matters based on a client grievance which alleged that Rocky Cota had performed patent legal services in the client's patent prosecution matter.

19. On May 1, 2018, Rocky Cota responded to OED's April 3, 2018 letter and informed OED that going forward Respondent would review and approve all patent filings with the USPTO for PLI customers and any substantive or legal communication with PLI customers would be from Respondent or dictated from Respondent.

20. Shortly after receiving the April 3, 2018 letter from OED, Rocky Cota contacted Respondent and informed him of the letter and that he had made patent filings with the USPTO using his deceased father's filing credentials.

21. Rocky Cota asked Respondent to enter an arrangement so that Rocky Cota could continue to represent PLI customers in patent matters. Respondent agreed to do so, but at

no time was Rocky Cota an employee of Respondent or otherwise eligible to receive Respondent's filing credentials or to be sponsored by Respondent as discussed in paragraph 8, above.

22. In April 2018, Respondent provided Rocky Cota with access to his USPTO electronic patent filing credentials and requested a new customer number from the USPTO with himself as the sole associated registered practitioner that listed PLI's name and address in the State of California for Rocky Cota to make patent filings for PLI's customers.

23. On February 1, 2019, OED sent Rocky Cota a certified letter informing him that he should cease the preparation, prosecution, and filing of patent applications immediately and to notify inventors, owners, applicants, or assignees that he was not authorized to practice patent law before the USPTO.

24. During the OED investigation, Respondent acknowledged that he shared his USPTO patent electronic filing credentials with Rocky Cota in April 2018 and authorized him to enter Respondent's electronic signature on certain patent documents.

25. Respondent represents that with respect to the initial patent application filings he understood that Rocky Cota would file documents with Respondent's signature only after Respondent reviewed them, but Rocky Cota made filings without Respondent's review or knowledge.

#### **Additional Considerations**

26. Respondent has not been previously disciplined by the USPTO, and he represents that he has never been the subject of professional discipline by any other jurisdiction.

27. Respondent has taken steps to prospectively prevent the same misconduct from occurring in the future, namely: Mr. Balsler has changed the contact information for all PLI customer numbers away from Rocky Cota to Respondent's address. Mr. Balsler also represents that he has changed his password and removed sponsorship for Mr. Cota.

28. Respondent has expressed contrition and remorse for his actions, and he acknowledges his misconduct.

#### **Joint Legal Conclusions**

29. Respondent acknowledges that, based on the information contained in the Joint Stipulated Facts, above, Respondent's acts and omissions violated the following provisions of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct:

- a. 37 C.F.R § 11.101 (competency) by (i) not understanding USPTO patent signature rules and allowing another person to sign Respondent's name on patent documents filed with the USPTO, contrary to the USPTO's patent signature rules and (ii) not understanding USPTO patent practice rules and improperly sponsoring Rocky Cota and improperly providing his patent electronic filing credentials to Rocky Cota, who used the information to file patent documents, contrary to the terms for subscriber agreements;

- b. 37 C.F.R. § 11.505 (assisting another in unauthorized practice of law) by assisting Rocky Cota, a person not authorized to practice before the USPTO in patent matters, in practicing before the USPTO in patent matters by, among other things, (i) improperly sponsoring Rocky Cota and improperly providing his patent electronic filing credentials to Rocky Cota, who used the information to prepare and file patent documents, contrary to the terms for subscriber agreements and (ii) allowing another person to enter his signature on patent documents filed with the USPTO;
- c. 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(c) (engaging in conduct involving misrepresentation) by allowing another person to enter Respondent's signature on patent documents filed with the USPTO; and
- d. 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(d) (engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice [*i.e.* the integrity of the USPTO patent issuance process]) by (i) allowing another person to enter Respondent's signature on patent documents filed with the USPTO, contrary to the USPTO's patent signature rules; (ii) improperly sponsoring Rocky Cota and improperly providing his patent electronic filing credentials to Rocky Cota, contrary to the terms of use for the USPTO's electronic filing systems and subscriber agreements; and (iii) assisting Rocky Cota, a non-registered individual, to practice before the USPTO in patent matters.

#### **Agreed-Upon Sanction**

30. Respondent freely and voluntarily agrees, and it is hereby ORDERED, that:

- a. Respondent is suspended from practice before the Office in patent matters, trademark matters, and other non-patent matters for ninety (90) days commencing on the date of the Final Order; and
- b. Respondent is placed on probation beginning on the date of the Final Order and continuing for twelve (12) months from the date of an order granting a petition seeking Respondent's reinstatement to practice before the Office;
- c. Directs that

(1) if the OED Director is of the good faith opinion that Respondent, during his probationary period, failed to comply with any provision of the Agreement, the Final Order, any of the conditions of his probation, or any provision of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, the OED Director shall

(A) issue to Respondent an Order to Show Cause why the USPTO Director should not enter an order immediately suspending the Respondent for up to an additional six (6) months for the violations set forth in the Joint Legal Conclusions, above;

(B) send the Order to Show Cause to Respondent at the last address of record Respondent furnished to the OED Director pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.11(a);

(C) grant Respondent fifteen (15) days to respond to the Order to Show Cause; and

(2) in the event that after the 15-day period for response and consideration of the response, if any, received from Respondent, the OED Director continues to be of the good faith opinion that Respondent, during Respondent's probationary period, failed to comply with any provision of the Agreement, the Final Order, any of the conditions of his probation, or any provision of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, the OED Director shall

(A) deliver to the USPTO Director: (i) the Order to Show Cause; (ii) Respondent's response to the Order to Show Cause, if any; and (iii) argument and evidence supporting the OED Director's position; and

(B) request that the USPTO Director enter an order immediately suspending Respondent for up to an additional six (6) months for the violations set forth in the Joint Legal Conclusions above;

d. Nothing herein shall prevent the OED Director from seeking discrete discipline for any misconduct that formed the basis for an Order to Show Cause issued pursuant to the preceding subparagraph;

e. As a condition of his reinstatement, Respondent shall provide to the OED Director a written, declaration, affidavit, or statement in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746 signed by Respondent that states he has successfully completed two (2) hours of continuing legal education credit on ethics/professional responsibility and that attaches corroborating documentation;

f. As a condition of his reinstatement, Respondent shall submit a written declaration, affidavit, or statement in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746 signed by Respondent to the OED Director that

(1) lists each patent document (by application serial number, filing date, and document type) where (i) Respondent was identified as the practitioner of record on the document, (ii) the document was filed with the USPTO between January 1, 2018, and the date of this Agreement, and (iii) Respondent nor any other registered practitioner did not review the document prior to the document being filed with the USPTO; and

(2) describes with specificity the steps taken by Respondent to identify such patent documents;

- g. As a condition of his reinstatement, Respondent shall submit a written declaration, affidavit, or statement in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746 signed by Respondent to the OED Director that
- (1) lists each patent document (by application serial number, filing date, and document type) where (i) Respondent was identified as the named signatory, (ii) the document was signed by other than Respondent, and (iii) the document was filed with the USPTO between January 1, 2018, and the date of this Agreement; and
  - (2) describes with specificity the steps taken by Respondent to identify such patent documents;
- h. As a condition of his reinstatement and in addition to any notice requirements set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 11.58(c):
- (1) Respondent shall provide a copy of the Final Order issued in this matter to applicants, owners, or assignees of each of the documents identified in subparagraphs d. and e. above;
  - (2) provide the copy by certified U.S. Postal service mail, return receipt requested or by a non-electronic delivery service that provides the ability to confirm delivery or attempted delivery;
- i. As a condition of his reinstatement, Respondent shall submit a written declaration, affidavit, or statement in compliance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746 signed by Respondent to the OED Director that avers to Respondent's compliance with the proceeding subparagraph and that includes copies of the correspondence sent and evidence of confirmed delivery or attempted delivery;
- j. The USPTO is hereby authorized to disable or suspend any USPTO.gov accounts registered to Respondent and those accounts with which he is associated as of the date of the Final Order approving this Agreement (i.e., all accounts that Respondent has ever established, sponsored, used in connection with his practice before the USPTO);
- k. As a condition of his probation, Respondent shall not apply for a USPTO verified Electronic System account, shall not obtain a USPTO verified Electronic System account, shall not be associated with another person's USPTO verified Electronic System account, nor shall he have his name added to a USPTO verified Electronic System account, unless and until he is reinstated to practice before the USPTO;
- l. As a condition of his probation, Respondent is prohibited from using, assessing or assisting others in using or accessing any USPTO.gov account(s) or other USPTO filing systems for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO;

- m. As a condition of his probation, until a petition seeking Respondent's reinstatement to practice before the USPTO is granted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.60, Respondent shall be prohibited, and the USPTO is authorized to disallow Respondent, from the following: (1) opening or activating any USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO; (2) applying for, or attempting to apply for any USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO; (3) being associated with another person's USPTO.gov account; (4) verifying, or attempting to verify, any other person's credentials in connection with USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO; and (5) sponsoring or attempting to sponsor USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO;
- n. Nothing herein shall obligate the USPTO to take action, *sua sponte*, to re-activate any USPTO.gov account(s) disabled or suspended pursuant to this order; rather, it is Respondent's sole responsibility to initiate any such re-activation of any such USPTO.gov account(s);
- o. As a condition of his probation, Respondent shall cooperate with the USPTO in any inquiry undertaken by the USPTO in connection with (a) allegations of unauthorized practice before the USPTO; (b) allegations of violations of the USPTO patent rules of practice; (c) allegations of violations of the USPTO patent signature rules; (d) any prospective show cause order(s), pending show cause orders, prospective sanctions order(s), or issued sanctions order(s) relating to patent documents filed with the USPTO where Respondent was identified as the registered practitioner of record, (including but not limited to the documents identified in subparagraphs h. and i.); and (e) other matters potentially or actually adversely affecting the integrity of the USPTO patent issuance process;
- p. The OED Director electronically publish the Final Order at the OED's electronic FOIA Reading Room, which is publicly accessible through the Office's website at: <https://foiadocuments.uspto.gov/oed/>;
- q. The OED Director shall publish a notice in the *Official Gazette* that is materially consistent with the following:

#### Notice of Suspension and Probation

This notice concerns Mr. Benjamin Alan Balser, Sr. of New Orleans, Louisiana, who is registered to practice as a patent attorney (USPTO Registration No. 58,169) and an attorney in good standing in the State of Georgia (Bar No. 035833). The USPTO Director has suspended Mr. Balser from practice before the Office in patent matters, trademark matters, and other non-patent matters for ninety (90) days and has placed him on probation for twelve months (12) for violating the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, namely: 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101, 11.505,

11.804(c), and 11.804(d) predicated on (i) assisting a family member in unauthorized practice before the USPTO in patent matters, (ii) improperly sponsoring the family member for a USPTO.gov account and improperly providing his patent electronic filing credentials to the family member, who used the information to prepare and file patent documents, contrary to the terms for subscriber agreements, and (iii) allowing another person to enter his signature on patent documents filed with the USPTO.

In April 2018, a non-registered, non-attorney, relative of Mr. Balsler asked Mr. Balsler to represent patent applicants with whom the relative was associated. Although the family member was not authorized to practice in patent matters before the USPTO, Mr. Balsler allowed the relative to prepare patent documents for filing, to use Mr. Balsler's credentials to file such documents, and to sign Mr. Balsler's name on such filings. Mr. Balsler represents that with respect to the initial patent application filings, he understood that the family member would file documents with Mr. Balsler's signature only after Mr. Balsler reviewed them, but the family member made filings without Mr. Balsler's review or knowledge.

Mr. Balsler agreed that he violated the following provisions of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct: 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 (a practitioner shall provide competent representation to a client), 11.505 (a practitioner shall not assist in the unauthorized practice of law); 11.804(c) (a practitioner shall not engage in misrepresentation); and 11.804 (a practitioner shall not engage in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice, *i.e.*, the integrity of the USPTO patent issuance process). He has taken reasonable steps aimed at ensuring that his unethical acts and omissions are not likely to be repeated.

Assisting another person in engaging in unauthorized practice before the USPTO in patent matters potentially or actually adversely affects the integrity of the U.S. patent system. Similarly, the impermissible entry of the purported signature of a registered practitioner by someone other than the practitioner actually or potentially adversely affects the integrity of the U.S. patent system. Further the impermissible entry of a signature in violation of USPTO rules of practice may result in the USPTO Director issuing sanctions against the patent applicant, including, for example, the termination of application proceedings. *See, e.g.*, redacted Final Order – Impositions of Sanctions” in the USPTO article: “USPTO terminates patent application procedures for fraudulent use of signature” (available on the agency's website at

<https://www.uspto.gov/about-us/news-updates/uspto-terminates-patent-application-proceedings-fraudulent-use-signature>).

Registered practitioners are reasonably expected to know (a) the applicable USPTO patent rules of practice, including the patent signature rules, (b) the provisions of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct implicated by such representation, (c) the potential harm to their clients when the rules of practice are violated, and (d) the potential disciplinary consequences when such provisions of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct are violated.

This action is the result of a settlement agreement between Mr. Balsler and the Acting OED Director pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 2(b)(2)(D) and 32, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.19, 11.20, and 11.26. Disciplinary decisions involving practitioners are posted for public reading at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline Reading Room accessible at <https://foiadocuments.uspto.gov/oed>.

- r. Nothing in this Agreement or the Final Order shall prevent the Office from considering the record of this disciplinary proceeding, including the Final Order: (1) when addressing any further complaint or evidence of the same or similar misconduct concerning Respondent brought to the attention of the Office; (2) in any future disciplinary proceeding against Respondent (i) as an aggravating factor to be taken into consideration in determining any discipline to be imposed, and/or (ii) to rebut any statement or representation by or on Respondent's behalf;
- s. Based on Respondent's agreement to do so, Respondent waives all rights to seek reconsideration of this Final Order under 37 C.F.R. § 11.56, waives the right to have this Final Order reviewed under 37 C.F.R. § 11.57, and waives the right otherwise to appeal or challenge this Final Order in any manner.
- t. At a reasonable time after the issuance of a Final Order approving this Agreement, the OED Director shall file a motion with the hearing officer seeking dismissal of the pending disciplinary proceeding.

(signature page follows)

(signature page for Final Order (D2025-24))

**LOUIS BOSTON** Digitally signed by LOUIS  
BOSTON  
Date: 2025.12.19 12:29:10 -05'00'

\_\_\_\_\_  
Louis J. Boston, Jr.  
Associate General Counsel for General Law  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

on delegated authority by

John A. Squires  
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and  
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing Final Order was sent, on this day, to parties in the manner indicated below:

Via first-class certified mail, return receipt requested, to the Respondent via counsel:

Ms. Kathryn W. Munson  
Member  
Stanley Reuter Alford  
Owen Munson & Paul, LLC  
909 Poydras Street, Suite 2500  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112  
*Counsel for Respondent*

and via email to:

kwm@stanleyreuter.com

Via-email to the OED Director:

Ms. Lena Munasifi  
Lena.Munasifi@uspto.gov  
*Counsel for the OED Director*

12/19/2025  
Date

Oranah Rusky  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450