UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
Natalie D. Mays,	)	Proceeding No. D2018-43
	)	
Respondent	)	
	)	

FINAL ORDER PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 11.24

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24, Natalie D. Mays ("Respondent") is hereby excluded from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO" or "Office"). Respondent's reciprocal discipline is predicated on her violation of 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h), having been disciplined by a duly constituted authority of a state.

Background

On March 20,2019, a "Notice and Order Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24" ("Notice and Order") was sent by certified mail (receipt nos. 70172620000001052856 and 70172620000001052863) notifying Respondent that the Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline ("OED Director") had filed a "Complaint for Reciprocal Discipline Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24" ("Complaint") requesting that the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office impose reciprocal discipline upon Respondent identical to the discipline imposed by the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia in *In the Matter of Natalie Dawn Mays*, case No. S18Y0315. The Notice and Order provided Respondent an opportunity to file, within forty (40) days, a response opposing the imposition of reciprocal discipline identical to that imposed by the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia in *In the Matter of Natalie Dawn Mays*, case No. S18Y0315, based on one

or more of the reasons provided in 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d)(1). The Notice and Order was also published for two (2) consecutive weeks in the Official Gazette.

Analysis

In light of Respondent's failure to file a response, it is hereby determined that there is no genuine issue of material fact under 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d) and Respondent's exclusion from the practice of patent, trademark and other non-patent law before the USPTO is the appropriate discipline.

ACCORDINGLY, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. Respondent is excluded from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the USPTO, commencing on the date of this Final Order;

2. The OED Director publish the following Notice in the *Official Gazette*:

Notice of Exclusion

> This notice concerns Natalie D. Mays of Atlanta, Georgia, who is a registered patent attorney (Registration Number 38,546). In a reciprocal disciplinary proceeding, the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") has ordered that Ms. Mays be excluded from practice before the USPTO in patent, trademark, and other non-patent matters for violating 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h), predicated upon being disbarred from the practice of law by a duly constituted authority of a State.
>
> Respondent was disbarred in Georgia after she failed to acknowledge service of a Notice of Discipline and then failed to file a Notice of Rejection after she was served by publication. Due to the default, the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia deemed the following facts admitted: Respondent violated multiple ethical rules when she failed, on numerous occasions, to communicate with a client who had retained her in a bankruptcy matter. Respondent failed to respond to that client's attorney in a pending personal injury lawsuit in order to settle that lawsuit and failed to respond to the bankruptcy trustee. In April 2017, the bankruptcy court entered orders sanctioning Respondent and terminating her as counsel for the client. Respondent did not refund the unearned portion of the fee the client had paid.

In aggravation, the State's Investigative Panel found that Respondent acted willfully by collecting a fee and then "abandoning" the client's legal matter, acted with a selfish motive, has substantial experience in the practice of law, has a prior disciplinary history, and failed to respond adequately to the Notice of Investigation. Due to Respondent's failure to file a Notice of Rejection, she was in default and disbarment was determined the appropriate sanction.

This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 32 and 37 C.F.R. § 11.24. Disciplinary decisions are available for public review at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline's FOIA Reading Room, located at: http://e-foia.uspto.gov/Foia/OEDReadingRoom.jsp.;

3. The OED Director give notice pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.59 of the public discipline and the reasons for the discipline to disciplinary enforcement agencies in the state(s) where Respondent is admitted to practice, to courts where Respondent is known to be admitted, and to the public.

4. Respondent shall comply with the duties enumerated in 37 C.F.R. § 11.58;

5. The USPTO dissociate Respondent's name from any Customer Numbers and the public key infrastructure ("PKI") certificate associated with those Customer Numbers; and

6. Respondent shall not apply for a USPTO Customer Number, shall not obtain a USPTO Customer Number, nor shall she have his name added to a USPTO Customer Number, unless and until she is reinstated to practice before the USPTO.

24 JL 2019
Date

David M. Shewchuk
Deputy General Counsel for General Law
United States Patent and Trademark Office

on delegated authority by

Andrei T. Iancu
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office