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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Anthony Darnell Cox, Jr.,	)	Proceeding No. D2026-39
	)	
Respondent	)	
	)	

FINAL ORDER

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.27(b), the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO" or "Office") received for review and approval from the Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline ("OED Director") an Affidavit of Resignation Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.27 executed by Anthony Darnell Cox, Jr. ("Respondent") on July 8, 2026. Respondent submitted the three-page Affidavit of Resignation to the USPTO for the purpose of being excluded on consent pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.27.

For the reasons set forth herein, Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation shall be approved, and Respondent shall be excluded on consent from practice before the Office in trademark and other non-patent matters commencing on the date of this Final Order.

Jurisdiction

Respondent of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania is an attorney admitted to practice in Pennsylvania, currently disbarred on consent. Respondent has practiced before the Office in trademark matters, but he is not registered and not otherwise eligible to represent other persons before the Office in patent matters. Respondent is a practitioner pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.1 and subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, 37 C.F.R. § 11.101 *et seq.*

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 2(b)(2)(D) and 32 and 37 C.F.R. § 11.27, the USPTO Director has the authority to approve Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation and to exclude Respondent on consent from the practice of trademark and other non-patent law before the Office.

Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation

Respondent acknowledges in his July 8, 2026 Affidavit of Resignation that:

1. His consent is freely and voluntarily rendered, and he is not being subjected to coercion or duress.

2. He is aware that, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.22, the OED Director opened an investigation of allegations that he violated the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, namely: [redacted]. The investigation delved into and obtained information, *inter alia*, about Respondent's disbarment on consent from the Bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pursuant to *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Anthony Darnell Cox, Jr.*, 68 DB 2024 (Penn. July 18, 2025).

3. He acknowledged that prior to his disbarment on consent in Pennsylvania, he was sent a letter by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel of the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania regarding an inquiry into his alleged conduct and potential violations of the Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct. The allegations regarding his conduct included, among other things, failure to communicate the basis of a fee in writing, misuse of client funds, and misrepresentations to clients and others.

4. In his statement of resignation submitted to the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, he acknowledged, among other things, that he submitted his resignation because he knew that he could not have successfully defended himself against the charges of professional misconduct.

5. He is aware that, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(a), a practitioner is deemed to be disbarred if he or she is disbarred, is excluded on consent, or has resigned in lieu of discipline or a disciplinary proceeding

6. He is aware that the OED Director is of the opinion based on this investigation that Respondent violated at least the following provision of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct: 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h)(1) (it is professional misconduct to be publicly disciplined on ethical or professional misconduct grounds by any duly constituted authority of a State).

7. Without admitting to violating any of the disciplinary rules of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct investigated by the OED Director in [redacted], he acknowledges that, if and when he applies for reinstatement under 37 C.F.R. § 11.60 to practice before the USPTO in trademark and/or other non-patent matters, the OED Director will conclusively presume, for the purpose of determining the application for reinstatement, that:

(a) the facts regarding him in [redacted] are true regarding his disbarment on consent in Pennsylvania, and

(b) he could not have successfully defended himself against the allegations embodied in the opinion of the OED Director that he violated 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h)(1).

8. He has fully read and understands 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.5(b), 11.27, 11.58, 11.59, and 11.60, and is fully aware of the legal and factual consequences of consenting to exclusion from practice before the USPTO in trademark and other non-patent matters.

9. He consents to being excluded from practice before the USPTO in trademark and other non-patent matters.

Exclusion on Consent

Based on the foregoing, the USPTO Director has determined that Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 11.27(a). Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation shall be, and hereby is, approved;

2. Respondent shall be, and hereby is, excluded on consent from practice before the Office in trademark and other non-patent matters commencing on the date of this Final Order;

3. Respondent shall be granted limited recognition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.58(f) for a period of thirty (30) days to conclude work on behalf of a client on any matters pending before the USPTO, and, if such work cannot be concluded, Respondent shall so advise the client so that the client may make other arrangements;

4. The OED Director shall electronically publish the Final Order at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline's electronic FOIA Reading Room, which is publicly accessible at https://foiadocuments.uspto.gov/oed/;

5. The OED Director shall publish a notice in the *Official Gazette* that is materially consistent with the following:

Notice of Exclusion on Consent

> This notice concerns Anthony Darnell Cox, Jr. The Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO" or "Office") has accepted Mr. Cox's affidavit of resignation and ordered his exclusion on consent from practice before the Office in trademark and non-patent law. Mr. Cox is not registered and not otherwise eligible to represent other persons before the Office in patent matters.
>
> Mr. Cox voluntarily submitted his affidavit at a time when an Office of Enrollment and Discipline ("OED") disciplinary investigation was pending against him. The investigation concerned, among other things, his disbarment on consent from the Bar of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania pursuant to *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Anthony Darnell Cox, Jr.*, 68

DB 2024 (Penn. July 18, 2025). His disbarment on consent in Pennsylvania followed allegations that he violated the Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct (namely, Rules 1.5 (fees), 1.15 (safekeeping property), 1.16 (declining or terminating representation), 4.1 (truthfulness in statements to others), and 8.4 (misconduct)) in view of his alleged conduct including, *inter alia*, failure to communicate the basis of a fee in writing, misuse of client funds, and misrepresentations to clients and others.

Mr. Cox acknowledged that the OED Director was of the opinion that his conduct violated at least 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h)(1).

While Mr. Cox did not admit to violating any of the disciplinary rules of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct as alleged in the pending investigation, he acknowledged that, if and when he applies for reinstatement, the OED Director will conclusively presume, for the limited purpose of determining the application for reinstatement, that (i) the facts set forth in the OED investigation against him are true regarding his disbarment on consent in Pennsylvania, and (ii) he could not have successfully defended himself against the allegations embodied in the opinion of the OED Director that he violated 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h)(1).

This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 2(b)(2)(D) and 32, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.27 and 11.59. Disciplinary decisions involving practitioners are posted for public reading at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline Reading Room, available at: https://foiadocuments.uspto.gov/oed/.;

6. Respondent shall comply fully with 37 C.F.R. § 11.58;

7. The USPTO, effective the date of the expiration of the period of limited recognition granted to Respondent as set forth in this Agreement, shall be authorized to dissociate Respondent's name from any USPTO Customer Number(s) and USPTO verified Electronic System account(s), including USPTO.gov account(s), if any;

8. Respondent shall not apply for a USPTO Customer Number or a USPTO verified Electronic System account, shall not obtain a USPTO Customer Number or a USPTO verified Electronic System account, nor shall he have his name added to a USPTO Customer number or a USPTO verified Electronic System account, unless and until he is reinstated to practice before the USPTO;

9. Respondent shall comply fully with 37 C.F.R. § 11.60 upon any request for reinstatement; and

10. Respondent shall not practice before the USPTO unless and until a petition seeking Respondent's reinstatement is granted by the OED Director via an order of reinstatement pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §11.60(d), regardless of whether Respondent becomes an active member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State.

TRICIA CHOE Digitally signed by TRICIA CHOE Date: 2026.07.21 08:35:35 -04'00'

Tricia Choe
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 Office

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

Via first-class certified mail, return receipt requested:

Mr. Anthony Darnell Cox, Jr.
2468 Magnolia Terrace
Harrisburg, PA 17110
Respondent

Via email:

Sydney O. Johnson
Senior Counsel for Enrollment and Discipline Litigation
Office of the Solicitor
[redacted]

Paul Nguyen-Ba
Senior Counsel for Patent and Trademark Disciplinary Matters
Office of Enrollment and Discipline
paul.nguyen-ba@uspto.gov

7/21/2026
Date

Sara L Nicholson
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450