



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

Office of the General Counsel

Wednesday, May 26, 2021

**VIA EMAIL**

Mr. Randy Landreneau  
U.S. Inventor  
17440 Dallas Parkway  
Dallas, TX 75287

Dear Mr. Landreneau:

Your Appeal of the decision in Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)/Privacy Act Request No. **F-21-00090** was received by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) Office of the General Counsel on **Wednesday, May 26, 2021**.

Your appeal has been docketed as “**FOIA Appeal No. A-21-00001.**” Any further inquiries regarding your appeal should include that number. A copy of your appeal is attached for reference.

The Agency expects to send its response to this appeal no later than Wednesday, June 23, 2021. You will be notified if it appears that additional time is required.

Sincerely,

Office of the General Counsel

Enclosure



May 25, 2021

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION APPEAL**

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL ([foiarequests@uspto.gov](mailto:foiarequests@uspto.gov))**

Office of the General Counsel  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Madison Building East, Room 10B20  
600 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

*Re: Appeal of Final Decision on Freedom of Information Act Request No. F-21-00090*

Dear Deputy General Counsel:

US Inventor (USI), a not-for-profit § 501(c)(4) corporation, hereby appeals under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6), the Patent and Trademark Office’s (PTO) final decision of May 4, 2021 on FOIA Request No. F-21-00090.

**I. Background**

On April 6, 2021, US Inventor filed a request under the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552 and 37 C.F.R. § 102.4, for the following records regarding PTO’s submissions to the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM):

1. Under 5 C.F.R. § 451.106(b), when the PTO recommends a bonus award that “would grant more than \$10,000 to an individual employee, the agency shall submit the recommendation to OPM for approval.” Please provide copies of all communications, documents, and records the PTO submitted to OPM pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 451.106(b) recommending awards for any of the fiscal years 2012-2020 inclusive, to any PTO employee working for the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. This request also covers any records the PTO submitted to OPM in support of such requests for approval, including those requested by OPM per 5 C.F.R. § 451.106(h).
2. Please provide copies of all communications, documents, records, and approvals that the PTO received from OPM in response to, and with respect to PTO’s requests identified in Request 1 above.

*See Ex. 1 (the “Request”).*

On April 14, 2021, the PTO acknowledged and docketed the Request as FOIA Request No. F-21-00090.

In an email communication including a file attachment named “Final Agency Response.pdf” dated May 4, 2021, the PTO issued its final decision responding to the Request, (the “Final Decision”). *See Ex. 2.* The Final Decision stated that the PTO “identified no records responsive to your request,” explaining that “[t]he Agency did not

pay out any individual award of greater than \$10k to PTAB Judges (non-SES members) during the period of 2012-2020.” The Final Decision further explained that any “awards over \$10K were performance based awards paid to Senior Executive Service (SES) members”—awards for which “the agency does not require OPM’s approval, as the SES guidelines for performance awards are different than GS/AD employees.” The Final Decision thereby essentially admitted that awards over \$10K to PTAB employees under the GS or AD paygrades would require the PTO to seek OPM approval.

## II. The PTO failed to search for responsive records within its control

The Final Decision asserts that the PTO “identified” no responsive records, without providing any explanation of how it established that such records cannot be found. The Final Decision does *not* base its response on a search—it does not say that a *search was conducted*, resulting in no responsive records “identified.” Rather, the Final Decision simply makes a conclusory statement that “[t]he Agency did not pay out any individual award of greater than \$10k to PTAB Judges ... during the period of 2012-2020.” No indication as to whether the Office’s Human Resource Department or the OPM communication liaison were consulted to establish the purported “knowledge” underlying the statement.

There is substantial evidence, however, that this blanket statement is outright false. OPM data on salary and bonus awards of government employees available to the public in the EHRI-SDM dataset clearly indicates otherwise. *See* Ex. 3. This data is compiled by a nonprofit organization and is searchable at [www.federalpay.org/employees](http://www.federalpay.org/employees). A search by PTAB Judge names identifies *dozens* of PTAB Judges per year since 2012 who received bonus awards well in excess of \$10K in a given year. For example, OPM data reveals that one PTAB Judge with a base salary of \$168,700 in 2015 received a bonus award of \$41,800 that year—about 25% of his base salary. Exhibit 3 shows a sample of compensation data for PTAB Judges who served in the identified AIA trials and received bonus awards including in some years in excess of \$10K. Unless the PTO violated the regulation in 5 C.F.R. § 451.106(b) and failed to seek and obtain OPM approval before paying these awards, it must have responsive records of requests and OPM approvals for awarding these bonuses. USI and the public are entitled to know the PTO’s bases and explanations for the circumstances justifying such large bonus awards for impartial adjudication of AIA trials.

The PTO bears the burden of showing that its search was calculated to uncover all relevant documents. *Steinberg v. United States Dep’t of Justice*, 23 F.3d 548, 551 (D.C. Cir.1994). “An agency fulfills its obligations under FOIA if it can demonstrate beyond material doubt that its search was ‘reasonably calculated to uncover all relevant documents.’” *Valencia–Lucena v. Coast Guard*, 180 F.3d 321, 325 (D.C. Cir.1999) (citations omitted); agencies are required “to make more than perfunctory searches and, indeed, to follow through *on obvious leads* to discover requested documents.” *Id.* (emphasis added). “As the relevance of some records may be more speculative than others, the proper inquiry is whether the requesting party has established a *sufficient predicate* to justify searching for a particular type of record.” *Campbell v. United States Dep’t of Justice*, 164 F.3d 20, 28 (D.C. Cir.1998) (emphasis added).

The Request established ample “predicates” and “obvious leads” to particular responsive records by specifically identifying the type of PTO communication with OPM on matters of bonus approvals under specified OPM regulations. The PTO provided no evidence that it conducted any search, let alone in its Human Resources or OPM communication files.

### **III. The PTO may not charge any fees**

As indicated in Section II above, the PTO has yet to perform a search and process for production any identified responsive records. To the extent that any fees may be calculated, USI is entitled to a public interest fee waiver, as explained in the Request. In any event, the PTO has by now forfeited its right to charge fees for this Request. The PTO has failed to provide written notice within the FOIA time limits set forth in 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B) that additional time for a search would be required, or provide “an opportunity to limit the scope of the request.” *Id.* (ii). The PTO is therefore barred from assessing fees in this case. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(viii)(I). Moreover, because the PTO failed to invoke “unusual circumstances” or “comply with the extended time limit, the agency may not assess any search fees.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(viii)(II).

Congress amended § 552(a)(4) of the FOIA in the *Open Government Act of 2007*, § 2. “To underscore Congress's belief in the importance of the statutory time limit, the 2007 Amendments declare that '[a]n agency shall not assess search fees ... if the agency fails to comply with *any time limit*' of FOIA.” *Bensman v. Nat'l Park Serv.*, 806 F. Supp. 2d 31, 38 (D.D.C. 2011) (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(viii)) (emphasis and alterations in original). If an agency is permitted to avoid timely search for responsive records by simply denying that such records exist, let the statutory deadline lapse, and then take indefinite time to commence a search only if challenged, it would render the 2007 Amendment superfluous because it would allow an agency to charge fees regardless of whether it complied with FOIA deadlines.

### **IV. Conclusion**

The PTO must vacate its Final Decision, commence a search and produce all responsive records promptly.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



US INVENTOR  
Randy Landreneau, President  
P.O. Box 2273,  
Clearwater, FL 33757  
[rlinventor@protonmail.com](mailto:rlinventor@protonmail.com)  
727-744-3748

# **EXHIBIT 1**

**FOIA Request**



April 6, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL [FOIARequests@uspto.gov](mailto:FOIARequests@uspto.gov); [efoia@uspto.gov](mailto:efoia@uspto.gov)

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

**Re: US Inventor Freedom of Information Act Request on PTO submissions to the U.S. Office of Personnel Management**

Dear FOIA Officer:

US Inventor, a not-for-profit § 501(c)(4) corporation, hereby requests under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552 and 37 C.F.R. § 102.4, the following records from the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office (PTO) regarding submissions to the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM):

1. Under 5 CFR § 451.106(b), when the PTO recommends a bonus award that “would grant more than \$10,000 to an individual employee, the agency shall submit the recommendation to OPM for approval.” Please provide copies of all communications, documents, and records the PTO submitted to OPM pursuant to 5 CFR § 451.106(b) recommending awards for any of the fiscal years 2012-2020 inclusive, to any PTO employee working for the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. This request also covers any records the PTO submitted to OPM in support of such requests for approval, including those requested by OPM per 5 CFR § 451.106(h).
2. Please provide copies of all communications, documents, records, and approvals that the PTO received from OPM in response to, and with respect to PTO’s requests identified in Request 1 above.

Please provide the requested material in its native electronic form such as Excel, MS Word or PDF documents, preferably by email to [rlinventor@protonmail.com](mailto:rlinventor@protonmail.com).

*Definitions*

“Records” are defined at 44 U.S.C. § 3301, and per 5 U.S.C. § 552(f)(2), include “any information that would be an agency record subject to the requirements of [FOIA] when maintained by an agency in any format, including an electronic format.” The terms “and” and “or” shall be construed both conjunctively and disjunctively.

*Public Interest Fee Waiver*

Because records requested herein were identified explicitly and may be readily located without undue search burden, US Inventor anticipates that under 37 C.F.R. § 102.11(d)(4), no

# US INVENTOR

Innovators, Inventors, Dreamers, and Builders

fees should be assessed. However, in the event that the PTO intends to assess fees for this request, US Inventor requests a public interest fee waiver because the requested records directly concern and bear upon the government's operations and activities, will be highly informative to the general public regarding the PTO's policies, including on matters directly affecting thousands of patent and trademark holders and applicants.

Upon receipt, we will make these records or their analysis publically available on our website at [www.usinventor.org](http://www.usinventor.org) for use by journalists, scholars, students, and interested members of the public at no charge, and use the information in reports, newsletters ([www.usinventor.org/subscribe](http://www.usinventor.org/subscribe)), and other public disseminations to advance our educational mission. Therefore, disclosure of the requested information "is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester,"<sup>1</sup> a 501(c)(4) corporation.

U.S. Inventor prefers to receive the documents by email, at [rlinventor@protonmail.com](mailto:rlinventor@protonmail.com) or some other electronic form that preserves all document integrity.

We may be reached at the address below, if you have any questions.

Respectfully submitted,



US INVENTOR

Randy Landreneau  
President  
P.O. Box 2273  
Clearwater, FL 33757

[rlinventor@protonmail.com](mailto:rlinventor@protonmail.com)  
727-744-3748

---

<sup>1</sup> 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); 37 C.F.R. § 102.11(k)(1).

# **EXHIBIT 2**

**PTO Final Decision on the FOIA Request**





## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

May 04, 2021

**VIA EMAIL**

Mr. Randy Landreneau  
U.S. Inventor  
17440 Dallas Parkway  
Dallas, TX 75287

Re: ***Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request No. F-21-00090***

Dear Mr. Landreneau:

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) FOIA Office has received your e-mail dated Monday, April 12, 2021 requesting a copy of the following documents pursuant to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552:

1. Copies of all communications, documents, and records the PTO submitted to OPM pursuant to 5 CFR § 451.106(b) recommending awards for any of the fiscal years 2012-2020 inclusive, to any PTO employee working for PTAB. This request also covers any records the PTO submitted to OPM in support of such requests for approval, including those requested by OPM per 5 CFR § 451.106(h), and
2. Copies of all communications, documents, records, and approvals that the PTO received from OPM in response to, and with respect to PTO's requests identified in Request 1 above.

The United States Patent and Trademark Office identified no records responsive to your request.

The Agency did not pay out any individual award of greater than \$10k to PTAB Judges (*non-SES members*) during the period of 2012-2020.

The only awards over \$10K were performance based awards paid to Senior Executive Service (SES) members. Since these award was paid under our OPM Certified SES performance system, the agency does not require OPM's approval, as the SES guidelines for performance awards are different than GS/AD employees.

You have the right to appeal this initial decision to the Deputy General Counsel, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. An appeal must be received within 90 calendar days from the date of this letter. See 37 C.F.R. § 102.10(a). The appeal must be in writing. You must include a copy of your original request, this letter, and a statement of the reasons why the information should be made available and why this initial denial is in error. Both the letter and the envelope must be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Appeal."

You may contact the FOIA Public Liaison at 571-272-9585 for any further assistance and to discuss any aspect of your request. Additionally, you may contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA mediation services they offer. The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS, College Park, Maryland 20740-6001, e-mail at [ogis@nara.gov](mailto:ogis@nara.gov); telephone at 202-741-5770; toll free at 1-877-684-6448; or facsimile at 202-741-5769.

The cost of this request was less than \$20.00 and is therefore waived. See 37 C.F.R. § 102.11(d)(4).

Sincerely,

**Dorothy G. Campbell**

Dorothy G. Campbell  
USPTO FOIA Specialist  
Office of General Law

# EXHIBIT 3

## Sample PTAB Judge Compensation records available to the public

**FederalPay.org** has created a search tool that allows public access to the OPM’s Enterprise Human Resources Integration (EHRI) dataset, which contains records of most civilian public employees of the U.S. Federal Government. The searchable database contains records for all Federal employees who earn over \$100,000 per year, or who are in the highest paid 10% in their respective agencies. Further information on this data source is available at [www.federalpay.org/articles/employee-lookup](http://www.federalpay.org/articles/employee-lookup). The following is a sample of such records from [www.federalpay.org/employees](http://www.federalpay.org/employees) for PTAB Judges empaneled on selected AIA trials identified at the top of each list.

*Select:* the Patent Office from the agency field; “All Years”; and enter the APJ’s name followed by clicking on “Search.” This results in a summary table display for the APJ. Click further on the APJ’s name hyperlink to obtain a new table with compensation breakdown by salary and bonus award for this APJ.

### *SG Gaming, Inc. v. New Vision Gaming & Dvlpmt. Inc.; CBM2018-00005, CBM2018-00006*

Frances L. Ippolito					
Year	Occupation	Paygrade	Base Salary	Bonus	Location
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$0	Portland, Oregon
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$0	Portland, Oregon
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$16,098	Portland, Oregon
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,606	\$19,240	Menlo Park, California
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,300	\$0	Menlo Park, California

Kevin W. Cherry					
Year	Occupation	Paygrade	Base Salary	Bonus	Location
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$16,241	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$16,241	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$169,695	\$24,683	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$154,268	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$151,243	\$100	Alexandria, Virginia

Christopher G. Paulraj					
Year	Occupation	Paygrade	Base Salary	Bonus	Location
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$16,273	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$16,273	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$33,066	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$27,691	Alexandria, Virginia
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia

***Unified Patents, Inc. v. Mobility Workx, LLC; IPR2018-01150***

<b>Kara L. Szpondowski</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$0	Detroit, Michigan
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$0	Detroit, Michigan
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$0	Detroit, Michigan
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$0	Detroit, Michigan

<b>Melissa A. Haapala</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$5,112	Denver, Colorado
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$5,112	Denver, Colorado
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$20,244	Denver, Colorado
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$5,010	Denver, Colorado

<b>William M. Fink</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	ES-00	\$180,624	\$14,569	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$14,569	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$27,043	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$10,855	Alexandria, Virginia
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia

***Unified Patents, LLC, v. B# On Demand, LLC; IPR2020-00995***

<b>Joni Y. Chang</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$27,125	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$17,125	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$33,910	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$31,883	Alexandria, Virginia
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$18,350	Alexandria, Virginia
2013	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,300	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2012	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,300	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2011	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,300	\$8,475	Alexandria, Virginia
2010	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$155,500	\$7,660	Alexandria, Virginia
2009	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$153,200	\$7,450	Alexandria, Virginia
2008	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$149,000	\$8,345	Alexandria, Virginia
2007	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$145,400	\$0	Arlington, Virginia
2006	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$136,557	\$0	Arlington, Virginia
2005	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$130,139	\$0	Arlington, Virginia
2004	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$123,437	\$0	Arlington, Virginia

<b>Georgianna W. Braden</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$17,125	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$17,125	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$25,390	Dallas, Texas
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$30,221	Dallas, Texas
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$0	Dallas, Texas
2013	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,300	\$0	Dallas, Texas

Arthur M. Peslak					
Year	Occupation	Paygrade	Base Salary	Bonus	Location
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$0	Millstone, New Jersey
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$0	Millstone, New Jersey
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia

*Amazon com, Inc. v CustomPlay, LLC.; IPR2018-01496*

J. John Lee					
Year	Occupation	Paygrade	Base Salary	Bonus	Location
2018	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$140,666	\$7,287	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$140,666	\$3,067	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$135,405	\$7,058	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$134,063	\$6,789	Alexandria, Virginia
2014	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$128,941	\$3,848	Alexandria, Virginia
2013	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$127,665	\$6,814	Alexandria, Virginia
2012	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$123,911	\$5,636	Alexandria, Virginia
2011	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$123,911	\$4,305	Alexandria, Virginia
2010	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$120,156	\$2,294	Alexandria, Virginia
2009	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$114,682	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2008	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-14	\$107,854	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2007	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-13	\$87,036	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2006	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-12	\$71,451	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2005	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-12	\$67,794	\$0	Arlington, Virginia
2004	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-12	\$64,008	\$0	Arlington, Virginia

Jessica C. Kaiser					
Year	Occupation	Paygrade	Base Salary	Bonus	Location
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$8,605	Denver, Colorado
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$8,605	Denver, Colorado
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$10,989	Denver, Colorado
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$156,984	\$14,128	Denver, Colorado

John R. Kenny					
Year	Occupation	Paygrade	Base Salary	Bonus	Location
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$5,163	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$5,163	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia

**Unified Patents, LLC v. SecureWave Storage Solutions, Inc.; IPR2019-00501, IPR2019-00932**

<b>Joni Y. Chang</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$27,125	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$17,125	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$33,910	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$31,883	Alexandria, Virginia
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$18,350	Alexandria, Virginia
2013	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,300	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2012	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,300	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2011	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,300	\$8,475	Alexandria, Virginia
2010	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$155,500	\$7,660	Alexandria, Virginia
2009	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$153,200	\$7,450	Alexandria, Virginia
2008	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$149,000	\$8,345	Alexandria, Virginia
2007	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$145,400	\$0	Arlington, Virginia
2006	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$136,557	\$0	Arlington, Virginia
2005	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$130,139	\$0	Arlington, Virginia
2004	<a href="#">Patent Administration</a>	GS-15	\$123,437	\$0	Arlington, Virginia

<b>Annette R. Reimers</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,502	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$156,134	\$9,231	Alexandria, Virginia
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$151,586	\$5,000	Alexandria, Virginia
2013	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$145,756	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2012	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$145,756	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2011	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	GS-15	\$132,505	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2010	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	GS-14	\$112,647	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2007	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-12	\$75,631	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2006	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-11	\$64,527	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2005	<a href="#">Patent Examining</a>	GS-09	\$59,672	\$0	Arlington, Virginia

<b>Garth D. Baer</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$13,717	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$13,717	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$11,826	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$8,350	Alexandria, Virginia

<b>Kamran Jivani</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$11,979	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$11,979	Cobb, Georgia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$15,285	Cobb, Georgia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia

**Canon USA, Inc. v. Cellspin Soft, Inc.; IPR2019-00127**

<b>Gregg I. Anderson</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$13,717	Coronado, California
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$13,717	Coronado, California
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$32,206	Denver, Colorado
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$31,065	Denver, Colorado
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$8,350	Denver, Colorado
2013	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$165,000	\$0	Denver, Colorado

<b>Daniel J. Galligan</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$13,717	Dallas, Texas
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$13,717	Dallas, Texas
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$170,400	\$23,652	Dallas, Texas
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$5,010	Dallas, Texas
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$167,000	\$0	Dallas, Texas

<b>Stacy B. Margolies</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>Occupation</b>	<b>Paygrade</b>	<b>Base Salary</b>	<b>Bonus</b>	<b>Location</b>
2018	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$8,605	Alexandria, Virginia
2017	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$172,100	\$8,605	Alexandria, Virginia
2016	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	AD-00	\$168,700	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2015	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	GS-15	\$158,700	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2014	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	GS-15	\$157,100	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2013	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	GS-15	\$155,500	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia
2012	<a href="#">Patent Attorney</a>	GS-15	\$155,500	\$0	Alexandria, Virginia