UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
Thomas John Finn,	)	Proceeding No. D2026-8
	)	
Respondent	)	
	)	

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

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(b), Thomas John Finn ("Respondent") is hereby suspended for sixty (60) days from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO" or "Office"), for violation of 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h).

Background

On March 27, 2026, a "Notice and Order Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24" ("Notice and Order") was sent by certified mail (receipt nos. 7021 2720 0002 1229 1343 and 7021 2720 0002 1229 1350) 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 and 11.3 ("Complaint"). The Complaint requested that the Director of the USPTO suspend Respondent for sixty (60) days from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the USPTO, predicated upon the order of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals ("DCCA") in *In re Thomas J. Finn*, No. 25-BG-0107, Disciplinary Docket No. 2024-D224 (D.C. Ct. App. June 5, 2025), which suspended Respondent on ethical grounds from the practice of law in that jurisdiction for sixty (60) days. The DDCA imposed this suspension based on the same underlying conduct that prompted a sixty (60) day suspension by the Arizona Supreme Court. Respondent was found to have continued to practice law while having been administratively suspended for failing to comply with continued legal education requirements.

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 in the order of the DCCA in *In re Thomas J. Finn*, No. 25-BG-0107, Disciplinary Docket No. 2024-D224 (D.C. Ct. App. June 5, 2025) based on one or more of the reasons provided in 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d)(1). The Notice and Order was delivered to Respondent on March 30, 2026.

On April 1, 2026, Respondent submitted an email acknowledging the notice pertaining to diciplinary proceeding D2026-8 and stating that in July 2025 he fully retired and ceased to engage in the practice of law, and that the Office should "[f]eel free to do whatever [the agency] need[s] to do when people retire from the practice of law."[1] (Exhibit 1). On April 3, 2026, the Office acknowledged Respondent's email and indicated it would treat the email as Respondent's response to the Notice and Order unless further communications were received from Respondent within the 40-day response period. (*Id.*) Respondent did not file any further communications.

Analysis

In light of the fact that Respondent does not oppose the imposition of reciprocal discipline, it is hereby determined that there is no genuine issue of material fact under 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d), and that it is the appropriate discipline to suspend Respondent for sixty (60) days from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the USPTO.

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

1. Respondent is suspended for sixty (60) days from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the USPTO;

2. The USPTO is authorized to disable or suspend any USPTO.gov accounts

[1] Respondent also identifies an address in Sun City West, AZ as his current mailing address rather than the address of record located in Tucson, AZ. The Sun City West address will be reflected in the Notice of Suspension.

registered to Respondent as of the date of this Final Order (including, but not limited to, all accounts that Respondent has ever established, sponsored, or used in connection with any trademark matter);

3. Respondent shall not apply for a USPTO-verified Electronic System account, shall not obtain a 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;

4. 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;

5. 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) 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 (4) sponsoring or attempting to sponsor USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO;

6. Nothing in this Final Order herein shall obligate the USPTO to take action, *sua sponte*, to re-activate any USPTO.gov account disabled or suspended pursuant to this Final Order; rather, it is Respondent's sole responsibility to initiate any such re-activation of any such USPTO.gov account; and

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

Notice of Suspension

> This notice concerns Thomas John Finn of Sun City West, Arizona, who is a registered patent attorney (Registration Number 48,066) and an attorney licensed to practice law in the District of Columbia Bar (Registration Number 447669), the State of Arizona (Admission Date 12/7/1992), and the State of Nebraska (Admission Date 09/14/1992). In a reciprocal disciplinary proceeding, the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") has ordered that Mr. Finn be suspended from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the USPTO for sixty (60) days for violating 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h), predicated upon being suspended from the practice of law by a duly constituted authority of a State or the United States.
>
> The District of Columbia Court of Appeals imposed this suspension based on the same underlying conduct that prompted a sixty (60) day suspension by the Arizona Supreme Court. Mr. Finn was found to have continued to practice law while having been administratively suspended for failing to comply with continued legal education requirements.
>
> 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: https://foiadocuments.uspto.gov/oed/.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.57(a), review of the final decision by the USPTO Director may be had by a Petition filed with the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia under 35 U.S.C. § 32 "within 30 days after the date of the order recording the Director's action." *See* E.D. Va. Local Civil Rule 83.5.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

(signature page follows)

(signature page for Final Order (D2026-8))

TODD J. TIBERI

Digitally signed by TODD J. TIBERI
Date: 2026.05.26 12:28:14 -04'00'

Date

Todd J. Tiberi
General Counsel
United States Patent and Trademark Office

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 parties in the manner indicated below:

Via first-class certified mail, return receipt requested, to the Respondent at the most recent address provided to the OED Director pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.11(a):

Thomas John Finn
19348 N 137th Ave
Sun City West, AZ 85375

Via e-mail to the OED Director:

Judson Peverall
[redacted]
Counsel for the OED Director

5/26/2026
Date

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