

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH,
CENTRAL DIVISION

Verbish v. Instructure, Inc.

No. 2:26-cv-00394-RJS-CMR, United States District Court for the District of Utah, Central Division (June 15, 2026)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Utah denies a motion for Tyler J. Bean's admission pro hac vice. The court concludes that Bean's four prior pro hac vice admissions in unrelated cases within five years exceed the limit under DUCivR 83-1.1(c)(1)(A)(iii), and that his explanation does not establish good cause for avoiding admission to the Utah State Bar.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Utah, Central Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cecilia M. Romero
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Utah
DECIDED	June 15, 2026
DOCKET	2:26-cv-00394-RJS-CMR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered Local Counsel's motion for Tyler J. Bean to be admitted pro hac vice in the action.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the good-cause requirement in DUCivR 83-1.1(c)(1)(A)(iii) and (d)(3) to the pro hac vice application.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished memorandum decision and order; precedential status not stated.
PARTIES	Verbish v. Instructure, Inc.

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure legal ethics and professional responsibility

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Tyler J. Bean established good cause for an exception to the District of Utah local rule limiting attorneys who have already been admitted pro hac vice in three unrelated cases during the preceding five years.

HOLDINGS

1. An attorney who has already been admitted pro hac vice in four unrelated cases in the District of Utah during the preceding five years must establish good cause to avoid the local rule's requirement that the attorney seek admission to the Utah State Bar; Bean's speculative statement that he did not expect to appear in additional Utah cases did not establish good cause.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A speculative representation about future litigation activity is insufficient to satisfy the good cause requirement.”

“Further, this court has recently concluded that an attorney’s specialization or experience in a particular area of litigation is irrelevant to the question of why an applicant with excess pro hac vice admissions should not be required to seek admission to the Utah State Bar.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Tyler J. Bean sought admission pro hac vice in the District of Utah. His application acknowledged that he had already been admitted pro hac vice in four unrelated cases in the district during the preceding five years, exceeding the local rule's limit of three cases. He explained that his practice focuses on large class actions nationwide, that he does not maintain an office in Utah, and that he did not anticipate filing additional Utah cases.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter was referred to Chief Magistrate Judge Cecilia M. Romero under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). Local Counsel filed a motion seeking pro hac vice admission for Tyler J. Bean. The court denied the motion because the application did not establish good cause for an exception to the District of Utah's limitation on repeated pro hac vice admissions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Mateo v. Empire Gas Co., Inc.*, 841 F. Supp. 2d 574, 576 (D.P.R. 2012)
- *United States v. Hvass*, 355 U.S. 570, 575 (1958)
- *Peterman v. Instructure, Inc.*, No. 2:26-cv-00374-RJS-CMR (D. Utah May 5, 2026), ECF No. 13

