

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES CORP., EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES LLC, AND
EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES AG,

Petitioners,

v.

BOSTON SCIENTIFIC SCIMED, INC.,

Patent Owner.

Case IPR2017-00060

Patent 8,992,608

Before the Honorable NEIL T. POWELL, JAMES A. TARTAL, and ROBERT L.
KINDER, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

MOTION FOR *PRO HAC VICE* ADMISSION OF EDWARD HAN

I. STATEMENT OF THE PRECISE RELIEF REQUESTED

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c), and as authorized in the Patent Trial and Appeal Board's ("Board") Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition (Paper 3), Patent Owner Boston Scientific Scimed, Inc. ("Patent Owner") respectfully requests *pro hac vice* admission of Edward Han as counsel in this proceeding.

II. GOVERNING LAW, RULES, AND PRECEDENT

37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c) states:

The Board may recognize counsel *pro hac vice* during a proceeding upon a showing of good cause, subject to the condition that lead counsel be a registered practitioner and to any other conditions as the Board may impose. For example, where the lead counsel is a registered practitioner, a motion to appear *pro hac vice* by counsel who is not a registered practitioner may be granted upon showing that counsel is an experienced litigating attorney and has an established familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.

(37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c).)

Further, the Board's Notice of Filing Date Accorded to Petition (Paper 3) states that a motion for *pro hac vice* admission under 37 C.F.R. § 42.10(c) "shall be filed in accordance with the 'Order -- Authorizing Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission' in Case IPR2013-00639" ("IPR2013-00639 Order"). (Paper 3 at 2.) IPR2013-00639 Order requires the *pro hac vice* motion to (a) be filed "no sooner than twenty one (21) days after service of the petition," (b) "contain a statement of facts showing there is good cause for the Board to recognize counsel *pro hac vice*

during the proceeding,” and (c) be accompanied by a declaration of the individual seeking to appear attesting to the following:

- i. Membership in good standing of the Bar of at least one State or the District of Columbia;
- ii. No suspensions or disbarments from practice before any court or administrative body;
- iii. No application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body ever denied;
- iv. No sanctions or contempt citations imposed by any court or administrative body;
- v. The individual seeking to appear has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial practice Guide and the Board’s Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of 37 C.F.R.;
- vi. The individual will be subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 *et. seq.* and disciplinary jurisdiction under 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a);
- vii. All other proceedings before the Office for which the individual has applied to appear *pro hac vice* in the last three (3) years; and
- viii. Familiarity with the subject matter at issue in the proceeding.

(*Unified Patents, Inc. v. Parallel Iron, LLC*, IPR2013-00639, Paper 7, at 2-3 (Oct. 15, 2013).)

III. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

Based on the following facts and accompanying Declaration of Edward Han in Support of Motion for *Pro Hac Vice* Admission (Ex. 2011), Patent Owner submits that a showing of good cause has been made and respectfully requests *pro hac vice* admission of Edward Han as counsel in this proceeding.

1. On October 12, 2016, Petitioners Edwards Lifesciences Corporation, Edwards Lifesciences LLC, and Edwards Lifesciences AG (“Petitioners”) filed and

served its Petition for *Inter Partes* Review of U.S. Patent No. 8,992,608

(“Petition”). (Paper 1.)

2. On January 23, 2017, Patent Owner filed and served its Preliminary Response. (Paper 6.)

3. On March 29, 2017, the Board issued its Decision Instituting *Inter Partes* Review. (Paper 7.)

4. Patent Owner’s lead counsel, Jennifer A. Sklenar, is a registered practitioner (Reg. No. 40,205). (Paper 4 at 2.)

5. Patent Owner’s back-up counsel, Wallace Wu, is a registered practitioner (Reg. No. 45,380). (*Id.*)

6. Mr. Han is a partner at the law firm of Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP. (Ex. 2011 at ¶ 1.)

7. Mr. Han is an experienced litigation attorney. (*Id.* at ¶ 10.) Mr. Han has been practicing law since 1985 and has extensive experience litigating patent infringement cases in United States District Courts and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. (*Id.*)

8. Mr. Han has participated in numerous patent infringement cases, wherein he has presented claim construction arguments during *Markman* hearings, argued motions for summary judgment and motions *in limine*, conducted depositions of expert witnesses regarding validity and infringement, and

participated in multiple jury trials. (*Id.*) By virtue of his patent litigation experience, Mr. Han is well versed in the law regarding claim construction and obviousness, which are at issue in this proceeding. (*Id.*)

9. Mr. Han is a member in good standing of the District of Columbia Bar and the New York State Bar. (*Id.* at ¶ 2.)

10. Mr. Han is also admitted to practice and in good standing in the following United States courts:

- United States District Court for the District of Columbia
- United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

(*Id.* at ¶ 3.)

11. Mr. Han has never been suspended or disbarred from practice before any court or administrative body. (*Id.* at ¶ 4.)

12. Mr. Han has never had an application for admission to practice before any court or administrative body denied. (*Id.* at ¶ 5.)

13. No sanctions or contempt citations have ever been imposed against Mr. Han by any court or administrative body. (*Id.* at ¶ 6.)

14. Mr. Han has read and will comply with the Office Patent Trial Practice Guide and the Board's Rules of Practice for Trials set forth in part 42 of title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.)

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.