

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

In the Matter of)	
)	
Prakash Nama,)	Proceeding No. D2026-2
)	
Respondent)	
<hr/>)	

FINAL ORDER PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 11.26

The Acting Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (“OED Director”) for the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO” or “Office”) and Prakash Nama (“Respondent”) 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 stipulated facts set forth below, is hereby approved. This Final Order sets forth the parties’ joint stipulated facts, joint legal conclusions, and agreed-upon sanction found in the Agreement.

Jurisdiction

1. At all times relevant hereto, Respondent of Bethesda, Maryland has been a registered patent attorney (Registration Number 44,255). 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.

Joint Stipulated Facts

3. Respondent is the founder and CEO of Global IP Services, PLLC (“GIPS”) which is a law firm based in Bethesda, Maryland. Respondent is a registered patent attorney (Reg. No. 44,255) and is licensed to practice law in Massachusetts.
4. At the request of a China-based entity 寰宇经纬知识产权, the English translation of which is Shenzhen Hyjinway IP Firm (“HYIP”), Respondent became the attorney of record in eighty-six (86) pending patent applications on behalf of China-domiciled applicants. Powers of attorney appointing Respondent as the attorney of record in these applications were filed with the USPTO between December 21, 2022, and March 1, 2023.

5. From July 26, 2023 to August 31, 2023, while Respondent was the attorney of record for the applicants, the USPTO issued show cause orders in the 86 applications. The show cause orders stated that the USPTO had reason to believe that Mark Wang of W&K IP inserted the S-signature of registered practitioner Jie Yang on filings made in the applications. Mark Wang is not authorized to practice before the USPTO in patent matters. The show cause orders required the applicants to show cause as to why the USPTO should not terminate the proceedings in the 86 applications.

6. Neither Respondent nor GIPS had been involved in the prosecution activities, referenced in the show cause orders, which occurred prior to Respondent becoming the attorney of record in the applications.

7. As the attorney of record in the 86 applications, Respondent received the show cause orders for all 86 patent applications.

8. After reviewing the show cause orders and learning about the activities of Mark Wang and W&K IP, Respondent informed HYIP that he did not want to respond to the show cause orders and no longer wanted to represent the applicants in the 86 patent applications. Respondent expressly requested HYIP to have the applicants transfer their applications to another U.S. registered patent practitioner.

9. According to Respondent, in response, HYIP expressly agreed to find another U.S. registered patent practitioner to take over the applications.

10. Respondent explained to OED that he did not file a "Request for Withdrawal as Attorney or Agent and Change of Correspondence Address" form (*see generally* 37 C.F.R. § 1.36(b)) because he trusted that HYIP would find other counsel for the applicants who would properly note his or her appearance on behalf of the applicants. Respondent explained that, based on his more than 20 years of experience as a patent practitioner, that was his standard practice, and that he had never experienced a situation where another U.S. registered patent practitioner did not take over the representation.

11. Despite HYIP's agreement to find another U.S. registered patent practitioner to take over the applications, no other U.S. registered patent practitioner entered an appearance in the 86 applications. Respondent candidly and freely acknowledged that he should have followed-up with HYIP so that he would have learned that he remained the applicants' representative of record and needed to take appropriate steps to withdraw.

12. From September 18, 2023, to October 29, 2023, while Respondent was the recognized U.S. registered patent practitioner for the applicants, replies to the show cause orders were filed in each of the 86 patent applications without the knowledge or consent of the Respondent. Respondent asserts that he was neither involved in nor had any knowledge of the preparation, signing, or filing of the replies.

13. In 34 of the 86 replies submitted, an officer or manager of a juristic entity applicant, instead of a registered patent practitioner, signed the reply in violation of 37 C.F.R. § 1.33(b)(3).

14. Respondent and the OED are unaware of the involvement of any registered practitioner in the preparation, review, or filing of the responses to the show cause orders in any of the 86 applications.

15. On October 1, 2024, the USPTO issued final orders terminating the proceedings in each of the 86 patent applications. Because Respondent remained the attorney of record, the final orders were all sent to Respondent and GIPS. Respondent did not notify the applicants of the final orders at that time.

16. In July 2025, Respondent withdrew from the 86 applications. At that time, Respondent took steps to notify the applicants of the final orders issued in the 86 applications.

17. Respondent has terminated his relationship with HYIP.

18. Respondent represents that he implemented a new standard operating procedure regarding withdrawing from representation in situations like that involved with HYIP, so as to ensure compliance with USPTO patent rules of practice regarding withdrawal and with 37 C.F.R. § 11.116 of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct.

Additional Considerations

19. Respondent has not previously been the subject of any USPTO disciplinary matter, and he represents that he has not been disciplined by any other jurisdiction.

20. On July 9, 2025, Respondent voluntarily attended a course on ethically terminating attorney-client relationships.

21. Respondent has acknowledged his ethical lapses, demonstrated genuine contrition, and accepted responsibility for his acts and omissions.

22. Throughout the investigation, Respondent was exceptionally forthcoming and fully cooperative with OED's investigation, including agreeing to an interview with OED and by providing sua sponte informative, supplemental responses to his original responses to requests for information.

Joint Legal Conclusions

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

- a. 37 C.F.R. § 11.116 (withdrawal of representation) by not taking reasonable steps to timely withdraw from representation in 86 pending patent applications; and

- b. 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(d) (practitioner must not engage in conduct adversely affecting the integrity of the USPTO patent application process) by failing to withdraw from representation in accordance with § 11.116 of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct and/or the USPTO patent rules (e.g. violating 37 C.F.R. § 1.36(b)).

Agreed-Upon Sanction

Respondent has freely and voluntarily agreed, and it is hereby ORDERED, that:

- a. Respondent shall be and is hereby publicly reprimanded;
- b. The OED Director shall 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/>;
- c. The OED Director shall publish a notice in the *Official Gazette* that is materially consistent with the following:

Notice of Reprimand

This notice concerns Mr. Prakash Nama of Bethesda, Maryland, who is a registered patent attorney (Registration Number 44,255). The USPTO Director has reprimanded Mr. Nama for violating 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.116(c) (withdrawal from representation) and 11.804(d) (conduct prejudicial to the integrity of the USPTO patent application process). The violations are predicated on Mr. Nama's failure to timely withdraw from 86 pending patent applications in which he was the attorney of record.

At the request of a China-based entity 寰宇经纬知识产权, the English translation of which is Shenzhen Hyjinway IP Firm ("HYIP"), Mr. Nama took over representation of foreign-domiciled applicants in 86 patent applications that were pending before the USPTO. A few months after Mr. Nama took over as patent attorney of record, show cause orders were issued in each of the 86 applications. The show cause orders stated that the USPTO had reason to believe that a person not authorized to practice in patent matters before the USPTO had inserted the S-signature of a registered practitioner on filings made in the applications. The show cause orders required the applicants to show cause as to why the USPTO should not terminate the proceedings in the 86 applications. Mr. Nama decided not to remain the practitioner of record in the 86 patent applications because he had not been involved in the prosecution activities referenced in the show

cause orders. Mr. Nama conveyed this to HYIP, which agreed to find another registered patent practitioner to take over the applications.

However, HYIP did not hire another U.S. patent practitioner and Mr. Nama did not timely file requests to withdraw as practitioner of record in the applications. There was no indication of the involvement of a registered patent practitioner in the preparation, review, or filing of the responses to the show cause orders in any of the 86 applications. The responses to the show cause orders were filed without the knowledge or consent of Mr. Nama. Ultimately, the USPTO issued decisions terminating the proceedings in all of the 86 patent applications.

After receiving the decisions in the applications, Mr. Nama withdrew from representation of the applicants and terminated his relationship with HYIP. Mr. Nama represents that he implemented a new standard operating procedure regarding timely withdrawing from representation in situations like those that involved with HYIP and ensuring compliance with the USPTO patent practice rules regarding withdrawing from representation and § 11.116 of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct.

Mr. Nama acknowledged his ethical lapses, demonstrated genuine contrition, and accepted responsibility for his acts and omissions. Mr. Nama was exceptionally forthcoming and fully cooperative with OED's investigation, including agreeing to an interview with OED and providing sua sponte informative, supplemental responses to his original responses to requests for information. Mr. Nama voluntarily attended a course on ethically terminating attorney-client relationships. Mr. Nama has been registered to practice in patent matters before the USPTO since 1999 and has never previously been the subject of any USPTO disciplinary matter. Mr. Nama represents that he has not been disciplined by any other jurisdiction.

This action is the result of a settlement agreement between Mr. Nama 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/>;

- d. Respondent shall cooperate fully with the USPTO in any present or future inquiry into any third-party entities (*e.g.*, foreign representatives or foreign associates, including, but not limited to W&K IP and HYIP) or person(s) who were involved in reviewing; preparing; signing; filing; or arranging for the reviewing, preparing, signing, or filing of any of the responses to the show cause orders issued in the 86 applications;

- e. Nothing in the 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;
- f. Respondent has agreed to waive all rights to seek reconsideration of the Final Order under 37 C.F.R. § 11.56, to waive the right to have the Final Order reviewed under 37 C.F.R. § 11.57, and to waive the right otherwise to appeal or challenge the Final Order in any manner; and
- g. The parties to the Agreement shall bear their own costs incurred to date and in carrying out the terms of the Agreement and this Final Order.

Users,
Choe, Tricia

Digitally signed by
Users, Choe, Tricia
Date: 2025.12.10
08:20:49 -05'00'

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 U.S. 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. Prakash Nama
Global IP Services, PLLC
4621 Chestnut Street
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
Respondent

Via email:

John Ferman
John.Ferman@uspto.gov
Counsel for the OED Director

12/10/2025
Date


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